

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO
CIVILIZATION
AN ESTIMATE



JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

AN ESTIMATE

BY

JOSEPH JACOBS



PHILADELPHIA

THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA
1919

COPYRIGHT, 1919

BY

THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA

DS
113
J15j

PREFATORY STATEMENT

JOSEPH JACOBS was a thinker and writer of unusual breadth and versatility. Among the subjects to which he gave his attention as early as 1886 was the comparative distribution of Jewish ability, as the result of researches he had undertaken in association with Sir Francis Galton. The present work was the natural outcome of these studies which appeared in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* and were afterwards republished as *Studies in Jewish Statistics*, 1891.

Dr. Jacobs at the time intended to write a comprehensive work, entitled "The Jewish Race—A Study in National Character," in sixty-seven chapters, the outline of which was printed privately in London, 1889. Unfortunately he never went any further with this plan. Similarly his idea of an even more ambitious work, "European Ideals—A Study in Origins," did not go beyond the outline which appeared in 1911. It was perhaps his occupation with this general subject which again turned his thought to Jewish contributions to European civilization. This subject engaged the attention of Dr. Jacobs during his last years, and, while he did not live to complete the work, it is fortunate that he at least left the first of the three books he had in

PREFATORY STATEMENT

mind in such form that it can be published without change. One of its chapters appeared in the first volume of the *Menorah Journal*, December, 1915 (pp. 298-308), under the title "Liberalism and the Jews."

The careful reader will notice that the Introduction and various parts of the book show the polished style of the master, while here and there the absence of his revising hand is keenly felt. Nevertheless, the brilliant mind, the wide reading, and the broad information of the author are manifest everywhere, and his calmness and objectivity of judgment will make this, his last work, a valuable contribution, not only to Jewish literature, but to the history of modern civilization.

Joseph Jacobs was not an apologete—his wish was to point out the share of the Jews in the world's progress. His occupation with the general subject had convinced him that the part played by the Jews had never been adequately acknowledged. On the other hand, he was careful to bring forward no claims which could not be substantiated by solid facts. It is a matter of deepest regret that he was not to finish his task and to bring the later chapters to the high level of the Introduction. Let us be sincerely thankful for what we have.

As stated in his Introduction, Dr. Jacobs had planned to divide this work, dealing with Jewish

PREFATORY STATEMENT

contributions to European civilization, into three books. In the first book, entitled "Jews of the Past," he intended to dwell upon Jewish achievement in the various fields of research during the past two thousand years and to show that the Jews have made themselves a constituent element of that civilization to which they are heirs equally with other nations, creeds, and peoples. The second book was to be devoted to the evaluation of the contributions of individual Jews to modern European culture in the immediate past and present. The third book was to determine the value of Jews in the modern cultural State and thus meet the question raised by the modern higher anti-Semites who, in consonance with their mediæval ideals, are opposed to Jewish influence in the Church-State which they would like to see revived.

When, in January, 1916, Dr. Jacobs died, this task had been but partially accomplished. Book I was practically ready for publication, though, had the author lived, he would undoubtedly have subjected many parts to a thorough revision. Of Book II he left notes, which would have served him as an outline. These notes show the masterly fashion and the thoroughness with which he had intended to treat this important subject. Nothing has been found of Book III.

Book I, being complete in itself, is herewith offered to the public, with the express statement that

PREFATORY STATEMENT

it has not been altered in word or fact. The author embodied in it a wealth of knowledge and information, accumulated during a busy and energetic life, and the arguments are marshalled with the brilliancy characteristic of Dr. Jacobs. It may indeed be said that the question raised by the higher anti-Semites, which was to be dealt with in the last book, has been adequately answered in the present volume.

During the last few years the political situation in many European countries has undergone radical changes, and it is therefore natural that some of the statements in this book should appear obsolete—such as the numerous references to the treatment of the Jews in Russia under conditions which have since been materially changed.

January, 1919.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFATORY STATEMENT.....	3
INTRODUCTION: THE HIGHER ANTI-SEMITISM.....	9
I. THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK.....	61
II. THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS.....	90
III. JEWS BECOME EUROPEANS.....	114
IV. MEDIÆVAL JEWS AS INTELLECTUAL INTERMEDIARIES...	138
V. INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT IN THE MIDDLE AGES	164
VI. JEWS AND COMMERCE.....	190
VII. JEWS AND CAPITALISM.....	218
VIIa. EXCURSUS ON SOMBART.....	247
VIII. THE BREAK-DOWN OF THE CHURCH EMPIRE.....	268
IX. JEWS AND LIBERALISM.....	293
INDEX.....	325

INTRODUCTION

THE HIGHER ANTI-SEMITISM

THERE is among the peoples of the world one which has preserved its individuality throughout the ages with remarkable persistence. This people is among the nations, and of them, but yet in some way apart from them. Up to a time within the memory of men still living, members of this people were set apart as unworthy to possess all the rights of citizenship in all lands in which they dwelt; even at the present day, a majority of them are still debarred from the higher rights of human beings. The only excuse or explanation for this discrimination against them was that they refused to bow down in the House of Rimmon, to worship strange gods, and to give up their way of thinking about the highest things which had approved itself as right and true to their fathers. Rather than abandon that faith they have, for the past millennium and a half, suffered continuously contumely and moral

INTRODUCTION

segregation, and from time to time torture and even death, while at successive periods they have been obliged to shake off the soil of their native land and seek refuge in other countries which for the time were less intolerant. These men are known by the name of Jews.

'Tis a little people, but it has done great things. When in the land in which it first came to national consciousness, it created a conception of the Highest Being of the universe, which has been adopted in essence by the foremost races of humanity. It had but a precarious hold on a few crags and highlands between the desert and the deep sea, yet its thinkers and sages with eagle vision took into their thought the destinies of all humanity, and rang out in clarion voice a message of hope to the down-trodden of all races. Claiming for themselves and their people the duty and obligations of a true aristocracy, they held forth to the peoples ideals of a true democracy founded on right and justice. Their voices have never ceased to re-echo around the world, and the greatest things that have been done to raise men's lot have been done always in the spirit, often in the name, of the Hebrew prophets.

INTRODUCTION

Nor did their beneficial activities cease when they were torn away from their own land by all-powerful Rome. For nearly two thousand years they have taken their share in all the movements that have made the modern European man. At times they have helped to spread culture from one nation to another; at others, they have helped to light it anew in a fresh land. On some occasions they have even been leaders in these movements, but mostly they have been content to take their share in the cultural development of their fellow-men, contributing to it by the qualities which their unique position among the nations had developed in them. In the intricate warp and woof of civilization Jewish threads have been at all times constituent parts of the pattern, and to attempt to remove or unravel them would destroy the whole design. By these contributions they have earned their right to continue to work for the European culture that they have helped to develop.

Yet, though the Jews have taken their due share in the culture and economic development of the nations among whom they dwelt, they have been pursued by hatred and persecution throughout the Diaspora. The origins of this

INTRODUCTION

Jew-hatred and antipathy are rather obscure. All imperialistic systems necessarily tend toward toleration of the different creeds of the divergent races, which they weld into empires. Yet we find traces of antipathy to Jews in the three great ancient empires, Persian, Hellenistic, Roman, as reflected in the Book of Esther, the Books of Maccabees, and in Josephus against Apion. Other aliens became natives after a couple of generations; other enslaved captives became freedmen, and their children full citizens; other religious cults were regarded as "licit" in the Persian, in the Hellenistic, and in the Roman empires; other races or sections were permitted to be autonomous within limits if only they provided their due quota of taxes and recruits. The Jews alone stood out and apart from the nations among whom they settled, and were regarded with disfavor by the ruling classes and, as a consequence, with hatred or contempt by the mob. The ancient city-states had their chief bond of union in the common worship of the local deity, and no Jew, while he remained a Jew, could share in this worship. Other citizens, together with this civic cult, could combine adhesion to widespread national or imperial

INTRODUCTION

deities; the Jew alone worshipped One God. He was the sole exception to the increasing tendency of the ancient world to syncretize local, national, and imperial deities into one Pantheon.

It is probable, however, that there was much less anti-Semitism among the peoples of antiquity than might appear from the scanty records of Jew-hatred, which consist mainly of contemptuous or inimical references by satirists like Juvenal, or embittered partisans like Tacitus. Men cannot live together in the common occupations of every-day life without engendering kindly feelings of communion. The wide spread of Jewish propagandism in the early Roman empire, of which there is increasing evidence, is sufficient proof of the friendly bonds between Jew and Gentile. The quick spread of Christianity among the resulting proselytes was a striking result of these friendly relations.¹ But for the action of the Church these assimilative tendencies would doubtless have continued till Jews would have been distinguished from their

¹The map of the early Christian churches attached to the seventh volume of Renan, *Origines du Christianisme*, is still the best representation of the Jewish Diaspora of the second century.

INTRODUCTION

fellow-citizens only by a difference of creed and religious practice.

Anti-Semitism indeed throughout the ages has been forced from above downwards as a part of political or ecclesiastical policy. The mob easily takes up State or Church cries without fully appreciating their bearing. Though persistent hatred is as rare as perfect love, it is easy enough to arouse ill-will in lower natures whose chief excitement in life is afforded by their enmities. We find an instance of this artificial creation of anti-Jewish feeling in the earliest record of anti-Semitism, the Book of Esther. As interpreted by Dr. Jacob Hoschander,¹ this romance embodies an actual stage in the relations between the Persian Jews and the Persian state. While willing to accept the monotheism of Zoroaster, they refused to accept the syncretizing religious tendency of the Persian Imperialists, and were thus persecuted as "Little Persians." Something similar seems to be at the bottom of the conflict with Antiochus Epiphanes, who evidently wished the Jews not so much to give up their own God as to accept the Hellenic gods

[¹ *Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, ix, p. 1, *seq.*]

INTRODUCTION

in addition to Him. The struggles against Rome under Vespasian and Hadrian were of a more purely national character, but, according to Jewish tradition, the last conflict had also its religious aspects.

Once, however, the purely national conflict was over, there was no reason why the Jews should not have amalgamated with other races of the Roman empire in all respects except religion. They were, indeed, in a more favorable position to do so than any other of the multifarious elements which constituted the empire of Rome. They alone could worship their God wherever they resided; their creed was connected with a book and not with a city or a land. Hence they rapidly acquired citizenship throughout the empire, and, before long, reached the final distinction of acquiring the *Jus Honorum*. For two hundred and fifty years, between the fall of Bethar and the *emeute* at Alexandria under St. Cyril, there are no signs of popular antipathy against the Jews in the later Roman empire. So, too, in Babylonia, Jews and Gentiles lived at peace for eight hundred years up to the persecution of Yezdegird II. These instances seem to prove that there is no innate

INTRODUCTION

tendency to anti-Semitism among the peoples unless forced from above downwards.

But all these assimilative tendencies were at once checked when the Christian Church became dominant in the later Roman empire. The Christian emperors deliberately deprived the Jews of the right to serve the State, and by 418 they were excluded from all public employments that could in any way give them authority over true believers. While their synagogues were allowed to remain (though no new ones were to be built), they were not allowed, under penalty of death, to make converts even of their slaves, while every encouragement was given to apostasy from Judaism. These signs of the ill-favor of the rulers were soon interpreted in the usual way by the mob, and the long series of Jewish massacres by Christians began at the beginning of the fifth century at Alexandria, instigated by the bishop St. Cyril. In the pagan empire religion was but a department of the State; in the Christian empire State and Church became identified, and the principle was laid down that none could belong fully to the State who was not a true member of the State-Church. Henceforth no Jew, while he remained a Jew,

INTRODUCTION

could have full citizenship in a Christian state; and Israel entered into a spiritual ghetto, not to emerge for a millennium and a half.

Islam borrowed from the Church the theocratic principle, and even bettered the instruction. The unbeliever was to be put to the sword, or, if one of the "Peoples of the Book" (Jews, Christians, Sabæans), was accorded a contemptuous and degraded tolerance. Henceforth both Church and Mosque put the Jews of Christian and Muslim lands outside the pale of citizenship. Under the Caliph Omar, Jews were ordered to wear a distinctive dress, and in 849 the Emir Mutawakkil emphasized the distinction by ordering the Jews to wear a badge as a sign of infamy. This diabolic expedient was adopted by Innocent III at the Vatican Council of 1215, and henceforth in Islam and Christendom the Jews were marked out as objects of contempt and degradation whenever they went forth among their fellow-countrymen. At the same time the callings for which they were eligible were more and more restricted, till at length the only methods by which they could earn their living were disreputable (usury, pawn-broking, peddling second-hand goods). Every

INTRODUCTION

Easter the pulpits of Christendom resounded with the outcries against the killers of Christ, and soon the myth of the "blood accusation" caused them to be regarded as infra-human by the credulous mob. The belief that they were affected by a mystic curse on account of their non-belief was encouraged by the Church as affording a perpetual object-lesson of the terrible results of infidelity. No wonder the mob from time to time carried into terrific deeds the broad hints given by the Church. There is scarce a city of Europe whose stones have not been stained by the blood of innocent Jews and Jewesses, slain to enhance the glory of the Cross. But the important thing to observe is that all these horrors were the direct result of the deliberate policy of the Church to mark out the Jews as objects of hatred and degradation. The anti-Semitism of the Middle Ages came from above downwards; it was no natural outcome of the clash of racial tendencies or temperaments. Again and again we find Jews and Christians joining together in friendly communion, even in common sport, the great equalizer of social distinctions.¹

¹ One of the most striking examples of this occurred in a stag hunt at Colchester in 1267, which I have described in *Jewish Ideals*, pp. 225-33.

INTRODUCTION

The only protection found by the Jews against the disabilities imposed upon them by Church policy was afforded by the royal or the imperial power, which found it expedient to use the Jews as indirect tax-gatherers. The Church set its face against all capitalism, which it regarded as "usury" and declared to be infamous and un-Christian. The Jews, unaffected by the Church fulminations, were tacitly allowed to lend money with the understanding that, in the last resort, the money thus accumulated was at the disposal of the king, who thus became the arch-usurer of his realm. The Jews thus became buffers in the mediæval state between the conflicting forces of king, nobles, and municipalities, and whenever the position of any of these forces became secure the Jews were expelled as unnecessary and expensive. In this way they were expelled from England in 1290, France in 1391, and Spain in 1492, while in Germany and Italy, where the struggle of the feudal forces was indeterminate, the expulsions were sporadic. Meanwhile in Eastern Europe a complex political federation had arisen to which the principle of a Church-State could not be radically applied. In the year 1386 the duchy of Lithuania was joined to

INTRODUCTION

the kingdom of Poland by a dynastic alliance with the Jagellon dukes. Now Lithuania was a member of the Greek-Orthodox Church, whereas Poland had been Catholic for nearly five centuries. It was, therefore, impossible to apply the principle of a uniform creed to the new federation, and for the first time since Constantine the principle that citizenship depended upon exact uniformity with the State-Church was broken through. The Jews found, therefore, an asylum in the Jagellon kingdom, and to this day the Israelites of those districts retain the German dialect (Yiddish) which they brought with them into Poland and Lithuania in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

A somewhat similar condition of affairs was produced in Central Europe by the Reformation. Here the churches and monarchs had to face the fact of divergence of creed among the inhabitants of a given area. For a time the old principle of a State-Church was kept alive by the curious expedient of making the people conform to the religion of their ruler (*Cujus regio, ejus religio*). But this attempt at establishing a dynastic Church soon broke down, and the rulers of North Europe had to take into account the

INTRODUCTION

fact that some at least of their subjects refused to be cooped up in the cloisters of the national Church. Anabaptists and Jesuits, Brownists and Quakers, made the question of religious toleration a matter of practical politics, and Jews no longer enjoyed the monopoly of exclusion from the national Church.

Slowly the idea grew of a citizenship apart from participation in the rites of the national Church. The conception gradually advanced that loyalty to the State was the primal duty of a citizen, and not conformity to the tenets of the State-Church. The internecine struggle of Huguenots and Leaguers in France brought out the first enunciation of the principle of religious toleration by the middle party of the Politiques.¹ From their time onward the principle has received wider and wider development in the thought of Hobbes and Spinoza, Locke and Hoadley, Voltaire and Rousseau, and broader and broader application in practice in the Holland of William the Silent, the England of William III, the Prussia of Frederick the Great, and

¹ See Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, chapter iv. It is, perhaps, worth while remarking that the chief intellectual voices of the Politiques, Jean Bodin, Michel l'Hopital, Michel de Montaigne, had each a Jewish parent

INTRODUCTION

the Austria of Joseph II. At last, in the cataclysm of the French Revolution and in the military state of Napoleon, with its "carrière ouverte," the principle was applied to the Jews, who were henceforth regarded, in increasing measure, as full citizens of their native states. The process of emancipation was a protracted one, and was not gained without doughty struggles of the spirit, carried on exclusively by the Liberals of Europe, mainly during the years from 1848 to 1870. From Waterloo to Sedan the Liberals of Europe were on the side of the Jews, and the Jews, as a matter of principle and gratitude, on the side of the Liberals; at the latter date all the countries of Western Europe had emancipated their Jews, and the principle of the unity of Church and State had thereby been practically abolished. Only one great State of Europe, the Empire of All the Russias, still retains the mediæval principle of a Church-State, even to the present day, and its Jews—the descendants of the refugees of Poland-Lithuania—are still treated as the ecclesiastical helots of a mediæval theocracy.

While the principles and practice of religious toleration were only applied to the close con-

INTRODUCTION

finer of Christian heterodoxy, the condition of the Jews, either before the law or in public opinion, underwent no amelioration. Indeed, it practically reached its nadir at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. But as soon as some of the leading spirits of Europe began to plead openly for a recognition of Jewish rights to manhood and citizenship, improvement became discernible both in legislation and in social recognition. Cromwell's liberal act in readmitting the Jews to England, the abortive Jewish Naturalization Bill of 1753, Von Dohm's plea, and the Abbé Gregoire's memoir, Lessing's noble *Nathan der Weise*, and Macaulay's resonant speeches had a cumulative effect upon the minds and consciences of Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Germans, who began to work for and with their Jewish fellow-citizens in order that they might take their place in the national progress. In the "sixties" and "seventies" of the nineteenth century it seemed as if the sempiternal antagonism between Jew and Christian had been at last allayed, and that henceforth they would work side by side without conflict or contention for the common good of their respective states.

INTRODUCTION

But side by side with the liberal tendencies of the mid-nineteenth century there has been a recrudescence of the earlier principle of the mediæval Church-State and the feudal subordination of classes which accompanied it. Immediately after Waterloo came the Reaction with its Holy Alliance, and the Jews of mid-Europe were at once thrown back into mediæval darkness, while the Hep-hep riots of 1819 showed that the mob were as ready as ever to reflect the changed attitude of their rulers. The Romantic movement in French and German letters, the Oxford movement in the Anglican Church, the revival of Ultramontaniam in the European Areopagus combined to bring back the mediæval ideal of the Church-State to the more conservative spirits of Europe. Meanwhile the feudal forces that had so long ruled Europe, already disrupted by the libertarian and equalitarian tendencies of the French Revolution, found their position further threatened by the Industrial Revolution and the rise to power of a middle class unknown to the *Almanach de Gotha*. This led them to band themselves anew in defence of king and Church, the only forces that could prop up their tottering supports. Thus arose

INTRODUCTION

the new Conservatism headed, curiously enough, in England and Prussia, respectively, by two converted Jews, Benjamin Disraeli and Friedrich Julius Stahl. The Clericals of Europe hastened to ally themselves with the renovated aristocracy who still retained their monopolistic hold on the military and official posts, even of the Liberal Governments of Western Europe. Thus the way was paved for the Counter-Revolution which was to dominate Europe after Sedan, and incidentally to raise again the spectre of Jew-hatred in a new form.

During the period between 1848 and 1870 the map of Europe was recast under the influence of the new principle of nationality. For nearly four centuries states had been formed out of incongruous elements, the only bond of unity in many cases being given by the common monarch. States were regarded as, strictly speaking, appanages of the Crown, and passed from family to family as the result of dynastic alliances. The felicitous marriages of the Hapsburgs, which gave them the Holy Roman empire and the Austrian conglomerate of nationalities, formed a model for all the monarchs of Europe, and kingdoms were recklessly formed out of

INTRODUCTION

discordant nationalities by the simple process of royal marriages. In process of time, however, this subordination to the same overlord welded some of these conglomerates into real nations with common speech, common customs, common law, and common ideals. With the clash of conflict in the Napoleonic era this communion of feeling and interest sprung into national consciousness, and in Spain, in Russia, and in Prussia, Napoleon dashed himself to pieces in the conflict with the new force. Henceforth those who spoke the same tongue and had the memory of the same historic deeds, suffered or wrought in common by themselves or their ancestors, claimed to be governed in common according to their own ideals. This mighty force led to the unification of Italy and of Germany and to the still unsatisfied aspirations of a United Ireland and of a United Poland. By a natural mythopœic tendency this communion of language and interest of memories and ideals was thought to be the result of common race or ancestry. Historians and *littérateurs*, after the fashion of their kind, reflected in ingenious works this imaginative national genealogy, and on both sides of the Rhine real literary ingenuity traced the

INTRODUCTION

course of history to the fountain-heads of race. Modern anthropology has entirely undermined this misconception, showing that throughout Europe there has been a constant intermingling of races since the Bronze Period of three thousand years ago. But it takes time for scientific conclusions to percolate through the people, especially when they conflict with national or local vanities. In the meanwhile the opposing chauvinisms of Michelet and Dahn, of Coulanges and Waitz, had aroused the animosities of the Teutonic against the Latin races, which found their culmination in the Franco-Prussian War.

The result of that war made the new German empire the arbiter of Europe and Otto von Bismarck the all-powerful influence within it. During the first stage of his career as Imperial Chancellor (1871-1877) he had to work hand in hand with the National Liberal party, to which all German Jews belonged, and among the chief leaders of which were Eduard Lasker and Ludwig Bamberger. One heard nothing of anti-Semitism in those days either in Germany or in the rest of Western Europe. But in 1878 Bismarck broke loose from the National Liberals, and allied himself with the Conservatives

INTRODUCTION

and Centre with whom his sympathies as noble, as Junker, as landed proprietor, and as authoritarian were much more thorough. Henceforth his chief opponents in the Reichstag were the National Liberals with Lasker at their head, and he directly encouraged the revival of Jew-hatred in order to discredit them. Virulent articles and pamphlets appeared in his "reptile press," and he even permitted the Court Chaplain, Adolf Stoecker, to disgrace his position by direct attacks on the Jews in pulpit and platform. Modern anti-Semitism was thus "made in Germany" by the direct encouragement of Otto von Bismarck.

This newer form of Jew-hatred could not be ostensibly founded on religious prejudice. Statesmen had had sufficient experience of the political evils arising from religious animosities from the time of the Wars of Religion in the sixteenth century. The newer doctrines of race and nationality afforded a seemingly safer basis of operations. Renan, the most potent literary influence in Europe, had tickled European vanity by a contrasted characterization of Aryans and Semites, in which the latter were declared to be inferior to the former in all the higher

INTRODUCTION

elements of civilization, even in religion. The enemies of the Jews eagerly applied this highly imaginative account of the Semitic genius to the Jewish race. They accordingly gave the name of "anti-Semitism" to their protests against any continuance or increase of Jewish influence in modern nations. Further virus was added to the movement by the remarkable economic development of Germany in which Jews, by their commercial training and international relations, took so prominent a part. They often outdistanced their Gentile competitors, avoiding the dangers of the new banking (the "Krach" of 1873); the realities of commercial envy and rivalry were thus added to the artificial incitements of racial animosity and nationalistic chauvinism.

In two other directions the particular conditions of Prussia—the dominant partner in the new German empire—enabled the Jew-haters to bar them out of two of the highest careers. Tradition has always closely connected the officers of the Prussian army with the nobility, who claim the right to consider the officers' mess as a species of club. Further, the Church in Prussia is "established," something on the same lines

INTRODUCTION

as the Anglican; so that in its way Prussia is a Church-State or, as it is technically termed, a *Cultur-Staat*, in which the Protestant Lutheran religion is regarded as an essential and indispensable part of the culture involved. The Prussian universities are regarded as special organs of the *Cultur-Staat*, and full admission to the faculties (which again were regarded as professional clubs) is restricted to members of the Established Church. Thus in Prussia, Jews, in the later stage of the Bismarck régime, were rigidly excluded from the officers' messes of the army and the professional chairs of the universities. The prestige of Prussia in the German empire caused its example, in these regards, to be followed more or less fully throughout the empire.

This specifically Prussian form of antipathy to Jews was voiced by Heinrich von Treitschke, the head representative of what has been termed the Prussian school of historians. He injected into his German history, which earned him the title of the German Macaulay, the ideals of the Junker party, which aimed at the predominance of the Conservative noble and landed classes of Prussia throughout Germany. He saw in the

INTRODUCTION

Jews the typical representatives of the Liberal mercantile classes, and attacked their influence in the most virulent terms. In particular he regarded the Liberal tendencies of Heine and Börne as specially corrupting, and indulged in unworthy and undignified language about their characters. He was opposed by Mommsen and Virchow, the two noblest voices of German liberalism; but his views have had immense influence on the official world of Germany, and have found their latest echo in the pages of Chamberlain. They are specially interesting as showing the influence of historic and political tendencies on an individual publicist. Treitschke seems to be expressing individual views; he is really voicing partisan theories.¹

The evident encouragement given to this recrudescence of Jew-hatred in its new form by Germany, which formed the model for the reconstruction of most of the European states (even including France), naturally led to imitation in less developed nations. In Austria and

¹ It is rather curious to find German ideals defended with so much heat by persons with names like Treitschke (properly Treitschky) and Chamberlain—not very Germanic names. Similarly we have Englishry defended from Jewry by a gentleman of the un-English name Hilaire Belloc.

INTRODUCTION

Hungary, politically strong allies of Germany, parties were actually formed to urge in the parliaments of these countries restrictions on Jewish political and even civil rights. Somewhat later in France, the home for over a century of liberal thought, anti-Semitic voices were raised among the reactionary parties which were attempting to restore Monarchy and Clericalism. Here Jew-hatred was further embittered by a disastrous financial experiment of the reactionary forces. Certain clerical financiers had induced the Faubourg St. Germain to entrust its capital to a banking organization known as the Union Générale, which was to replace the Rothschilds as the repository of Catholic funds. Unfortunately the Union failed, and the impoverished aristocracy were led to see the cause of their financial ruin in the machinations of the Jews. At the same time the Jesuits were attempting to obtain a monopoly of the French officers' messes for their pupils, in the interests of a monarchical restoration, and advocated, after the Prussian model, the rejection of the Jews from the rank of officers. The notorious case of Captain Dreyfus was the outcome of this, and finally wrecked the clerical plot to get control of the army.

INTRODUCTION

Meanwhile in Eastern Europe the theoretical encouragement thus given to the revival of Jew-hatred by the Counter-Revolutionary principles of the aristocratic, militaristic, and Clerical factions of North-western Europe, encouraged by the precept and example of Bismarck, had been translated into action by the mob of Russia. In that country, the sole survival of the mediæval Church-State among the Governments of Europe, the Jews, regarded as a legacy from old Poland and confined within the ancient limits of that kingdom, were marked out for the enmity of the populace by every form of degrading disability. At the death of the Liberator Czar Alexander II, in 1881, the excitement of the people found its vent in attacks upon the Jews, which were encouraged by the officials, as time was thus given them to organize the Reaction which then took shape. The widespread sympathy aroused for the Jewish victims, especially in Anglo-Saxon lands, led to a continuous exodus from the Russian house of bondage, and colonies of Russian Jews began to spread throughout the civilized world, notably adding to the Jewish population of France, England, and America (Germany having practically closed its doors

INTRODUCTION

to any accession from Russia). This exodus added a new element to whatever relics had survived of the older anti-Jewish prejudices of these lands. Whereas previously they had become identified in every respect with the *Sittlichkeit* of their fellow-citizens, while preserving their distinctive religious tenets and practices, they were now once more regarded as aliens, since a large number of them were no longer native-born. Within thirty years nearly a million and a half Jews from Eastern Europe had been added to the third of a million already settled in these three countries, many of whom had themselves been born elsewhere. It would indeed be surprising if so large a transference of human beings from one environment to others entirely different could be effected without producing some signs of restiveness in the countries concerned. On the whole, however, the Anglo-Saxon countries have come through the ordeal with a triumphant vindication of their essential principles of justice and liberalism. Indeed it would be difficult for either to act otherwise. England, as the head of an empire composed of multifarious races and creeds, could not logically take discriminative steps against any one creed

INTRODUCTION

or race. America, whose greatness is founded upon the hospitable welcome she has given to the oppressed or adventurous of all lands, was only acting in accordance with her true self in affording a shelter to the oppressed Russian and Roumanian Jews.

Yet even in these favored lands there have been some signs of a revival of anti-Jewish prejudice. In England the Alien Act of 1905 was almost avowedly directed to checking Jewish immigration, and of recent years a few utterances in the public press have re-echoed the anti-Semitic sentiments in the same reactionary circles as on the Continent of Europe. In America, where a reversion to the class distinctions of Europe is making itself shown, certain restrictions of social intercourse with Jews have insinuated themselves in summer resorts, private schools, university clubs, and even in university faculties. It is possible that the latter tendency may be traced to the indirect influence of the Prussian universities which have been attended by so many American professors.

It will thus be seen from this rough sketch of the more recent phases of anti-Semitism that this is due, almost entirely, to the initiative of Prince

INTRODUCTION

Bismarck in the later stage of his policy. But its comparatively wide spread proves that it appeals to certain general sentiments that have to be taken into account. Any divergence from the social norm to which men are accustomed arouses their antipathy as implying the possibility that their own thoughts or ways are not the best. " 'Ere's a stranger, Bill; 'eave 'alf a brick at 'im," was Punch's way of *putting* this feeling. The Jew differs from others in practices and beliefs with regard to the matters which men still consider the most fundamental and important. The more rigid among them refuse commensality to their Gentile neighbors, in accordance with their dietary laws, and thus stand in the way of the most practical form of social communion. Again they are endogamous, and, to prevent intermarriage, have, almost as a matter of course, to put a bar upon intercourse between their young people. In addition to all this, as has been shown above, the majority of Jews in western lands have again become aliens owing to the tyranny of Russia. Finally, the crude theories of race, which had so much to do with the creation of new nationalities in the nineteenth century, have now become part of the popular consciousness, and

INTRODUCTION

the comparatively easy identification of Jews as of a different race causes these various divergencies to become conscious at every point of social contact. Other communities of different race and religion have aroused the same sort of antipathy: the Scotch in England in Johnson's time; the Irish in America before the Civil War; Germans in Russia; Poles in Germany; Armenians in Turkey—the list seems interminable. Yet many of these antipathies have died away when not encouraged by the higher minds of the dominant races; and it should be the hope of all good citizens that the appeal of Jew-hatred to the lower minds of men will also suffer a final extinction.

When men hate one another, they invariably defend their hatred on the ground of high principle. Even the wolf of fable did not devour the lamb till it had recited various excuses for its meal. Similarly, the anti-Semite of to-day alleges various reasons why he would deny the Jew the right hand of fellowship and sometimes even the rights of citizenship. I propose, in the following pages, to discuss the reasons given for opposition to Jews, so far as these are based upon real principles of action and not merely instinctive or imitative antipathies. As shown above,

INTRODUCTION

most anti-Semites, who have acted on any kind of principle, have been either members of the privileged and reactionary classes or have voiced their views. Regarding the Jews as inimical to the principles which they consider as best for their respective nations, they have fought strenuously against what they term Jewish influence, and, as far as they were sincere, were perfectly justified in so doing, provided they fought fairly. The mere fact that, in combating Jewish influence, they were attempting to retain or further their own does not, in the slightest, militate against their sincerity or justification. The very essence of civilized government is to allow each interest in a state to exercise as much influence as it can in favor of itself, provided this cannot be shown to be to the detriment of the whole. So far as these newer forms of anti-Jewish antipathy are based on any kind of principle, they may be said to constitute the higher anti-Semitism as contrasted with lower forms, which are merely imitative, unreflective, and almost entirely the outcome of the natural tendency to hate the man in any way different from ourselves, which is part of our lower nature.

These higher anti-Semites attack the Jews from

INTRODUCTION

different, and often contradictory, standpoints, which it may be as well to enumerate roughly. There is, first and foremost, the nationalistic school, which regards the Jews as both alien in origin and alien in spirit, and hence a disturbing element of the national ideals. These are often joined by the ultra-Conservatives, who, remembering the recent connection of Jews with Liberalism, regard them as typically Liberal. Certain sections of the Roman Catholic Church, especially the Jesuits and Ultramontanes, follow in the Jewish question that rigid consistency of policy, which is the admiration of their enemies and the despair of their friends. In addition to the old grounds of antipathy to Jews, the Curia regards the Jews as the chief moving spirits of what it regards as its chief enemies—Freemasonry and Secularism. Then there is the scarcely avowed militaristic school which regards the Jews as the representatives of capitalism and therefore on principle opposed to war. These four tendencies (nationalistic, conservative, militaristic, Catholic or High Church) are often found combined in Germany, Austria, France, and England. Certain sections of Socialists are opposed to the Jews as typical capitalists, whereas one of the heads of

INTRODUCTION

their offending to reactionary parties everywhere is that Socialism is so largely Jewish. Many earnest Christians, even outside the Roman Catholic Church, consider that the Jews have been the main instrument in undermining Christian dogmas, and are, therefore, opposed to them on that ground. On the other hand, there is quite a school of Neo-Pagans, like my friend the late Prof. York Powell, who regard the Jews as responsible for saddling Europe with an alien faith. The New Aristocracy of Nietzsche and his followers consider the Jews responsible for the "slavish" morality of Christendom. It is perhaps unnecessary to refer to isolated and eccentric views like those of Mr. Stanton Coit, of the London Ethical Society, who regards the Jews, owing to their cosmopolitanism, as a disturbing element in the national-ethical churches—each, as it were, with a separate national god—which he would like to see established. Another such sporadic case is that of Mr. Chesterton, who appears to be prejudiced against the Jews on the general principle that a fine old crusty prejudice is a good old Johnsonian quality.

Various as are the voices thus raised against the Jews, there is one ground-tone which swells

INTRODUCTION

out above the rest and becomes dominant. As might have been anticipated from our historical sketch, it is that of the Counter-Revolution, the anti-Liberal movement which spread through Europe after 1870 under the influence of Bismarck. This has recently found a representative utterance in Chamberlain's *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, which, in many ways, sums up the whole anti-Semitic movement from Renan to Treitschke. Though really superficial and inconsistent, Chamberlain's book has had an extraordinary popularity because it flatters the national and racial vanity of Germans (and incidentally of Englishmen), who are represented to be the Chosen Race, from whom alone real genius and real progress can be anticipated. As part of his argument he has been compelled to show that the other claimants for the title of Chosen Race, the Jews, have no claim to creative genius, even in religion; and this has helped to increase the popularity of his book, since attacks are always popular, and he has been able to appeal to the conscious and unconscious anti-Semitism of his readers. He makes some show of basing his claims for the racial superiority of the Germans upon modern anthropological science; but even he

INTRODUCTION

has to confess his failure in this regard, and finally bases his views on his own "historic insight"—in other words, prejudice. The marked attention which Chamberlain pays to the Jews is indeed a high compliment, and it is worth while remarking that, while formerly Jews were despised as of inferior culture, they now seem to be feared as of different culture, uneasily suspected to be higher.¹ Otherwise, why Mr. Chamberlain's diatribes?

It is time to come to an understanding with these anti-Semites; to speak, as it were, with the enemy in the gate. If the above diagnosis of the history of Jew-hatred be true, it has always come from above downwards, and has always been kept alive among the people by the knowledge that it is supported by the opinions of men whom they respect. Popular opposition to Jews, as to Catholics, Quakers, or Agnostics, can only be removed or lessened if the higher intellectuals of the nations recognize its injustice and futility. The belief in Jewish badness can only disappear in the same way as the belief in witches and ghosts; and it is characteristic that the revival of the one be-

¹ See the remarkable book of the late Prof. Shaler, *The Neighbor*.

INTRODUCTION

lief has been synchronous with the recrudescence of the others, very much in the same quarters.

For this purpose it is not sufficient merely to answer the arguments of the higher anti-Semites; in its broader aspects the Jewish question raises any number of fundamental problems of modern society—political, economic, social, and religious—which no one could profess to solve as side-issues of what is itself a side-issue. Thus to reply adequately to the four chief lines of attack mentioned above would be to defend the modern spirit against the Counter-Revolution.¹ It would be impossible, as a side-issue of the Jewish question, to convince Conservatives of the claims to existence of Liberalism and Democracy; nor could one discuss the intricate problem of peace and war in order to mollify the militaristic school of anti-Semites. One might perhaps convince the Roman Catholic Church that the enemies of the Jews were in reality its own enemies and that the connection of Jews with Freemasonry was not so close as it imagines. But it would be impossible for it to relinquish its old principle of the Church-State

¹ Compare Renan: "Les ennemis du Judaïsme, regardez-y de pres, vous verrez que ce sont en général des ennemis de l'esprit moderne."

without ceasing to be Catholicism. So, too, it would be easy to prove to Orthodox Christians that, so far from undermining religion by their scepticism, Jews have had their own religion equally undermined by the spirit of the age.¹ But they could never be convinced that the existence of Judaism is not a standing protest against the doctrines of the Trinity. Socialistic enemies of the Jews might, perhaps, be left to fight it out with the anti-socialistic section, but one could scarcely discuss the whole question of Socialism as part of our topic. Similarly, the Neo-Pagans and the New Aristocrats might be left to discuss their anti-Semitic views with their Christian and Democratic opponents, but the fundamental questions involved between the two schools could scarcely be solved as an excursus to the discussion of the Jewish question.

No, the Jewish defence, if it is to be at all effective, must be of a direct and positive character. The claim of the Jews to a "place in the sun," in modern life, must, in the last resort, be based on their capacity for contributing valuable elements to that life. This can only be determined by the

¹This was clearly seen by the late Leroy Beaulieu in his *Israel Among the Nations*.

INTRODUCTION

history of the past, remote and recent. Unless they have shown themselves in the past capable of contributing to the higher aspects of European culture, it would be improbable that they would be able to join fully in it now that they are allowed, in some measure, to work with their fellow-citizens. Again, if they have acquired, by a long process of unnatural selection, any special capabilities, adapting them for special work in the world, this ought to show itself in actual achievement during recent times, when they have been allowed, to some extent, to show their capacity. We know little of the forces that make or modify racial character, but we do know, from the widest inductions of history and common observation, that it is one of the most permanent forces on earth; so much may be granted to race-theorists like Gobineau or Chamberlain. Frenchmen repeat to this day most of the characteristics of Cæsar's Gauls; the Englishry of Edward I or Chaucer is as marked as that of Edward VII or William Morris. So, too, the Jewish martyrs of York Castle in 1190 recall to the English Chroniclers of the time the very lineaments of the heroes of Jerusalem 1,120 years previously. Karl Marx shows, on behalf of the bearers of the

INTRODUCTION

world's burdens, the exalted indignation of an Isaiah. Henri Bergson seems destined to take the same place in the world's thought of the twentieth century that Maimonides did in the twelfth and Spinoza did in the seventeenth. Heinrich Heine only shows, in higher degree and more modern form, the same incisive wit that animates Judah al-Harizi or Immanuel of Rome. If it can be shown that Jews throughout the ages have contributed their share to the world's higher life and have, by their experiences, acquired specific capacities to continue to do so, they have a right to say to the world: "Stand aside; let us to our appointed work."

To raise the further inquiry whether Jews are likeable or "clubable" is rather a young lady's or a snob's question than a man's. The peoples that have fashioned the world—Phœnicians and Romans, Normans and Spaniards, Englishmen and Prussians, Yankees and Japs—have not made themselves liked in the process. Their claim to existence and influence has been based upon the work they have done for the world quite apart from their likeability. So, in the last resort, must it be with Jews.

If these considerations are correct, our task in

INTRODUCTION

the present work must be to appraise Jewish contributions to the world's culture, and it is needless to dilate upon the difficulties of such a task. If it be difficult, in Burke's phrase, to indict a whole nation, it is even less easy to appraise its worth. The complications are both objective and subjective, or, to avoid those hateful words, material and personal. It is no slight task to adjudge the spiritual work of a historic people throughout three thousand years, during the major part of which they have been scattered over all the lands of civilization. A people contributes to the world's progress either through its institutions and general tendencies or through its individualities. The chief institution in which Jewish influence is prominent is the Christian Church, which, in its organization, its liturgy, and much of its spirit, still shows traces of its Jewish origin. Above all, the Bible, which has permeated Christendom in thousands of ways, is the noblest product of the Hebraic spirit, and is, in its way, a Jewish institution. During the Middle Ages the Jews, by their spread among the nations, were enabled to contribute to the intellectual and commercial development of Europe by their activities as intermediaries in thought and commerce. They

INTRODUCTION

even contributed, in an indirect way, to the building up of the feudal kingship, and constituted one of the unifying elements of the mediæval European system. Their position as forming the sole exception to the Christian consensus had its influence in promoting the slow development of free thought and religious toleration. They had their contributions to add both to the Renaissance and to the Reformation, and it is notorious that the modern trend toward political liberty and democratic institutions in the Anglo-Saxon world was largely influenced by the principles of the Hebrew Scriptures. In more modern times Jews have had much to do in shaping the principles and policy of that large movement of the world's thought known as Socialism. A recent work of Prof. Sombart even goes so far as to assert that the transformation of the economic constitution of society, caused by capitalistic methods of production, is due mainly to the Jews; and this claim would have to be considered and measured.

In short, to appraise the contributions of Jews to the world's advancement is little less than to write the history of civilization for the past two thousand years. Fortunately, for the particular end in view, the work has been done, in large

INTRODUCTION

measure, sporadically and for other purposes. For the past fifty years Jewish and Gentile scholars have thrown the light of research upon all these topics,¹ and, while it is difficult, it will not be impossible to summarize their results sufficiently for the particular purpose we have in view.

When we come to the latest age, since the Jewish emancipation, we have to deal with individuals rather than with institutions or tendencies. The number of Jews who have contributed in one way or another to the world's progress, instruction, and delight in recent years is indeed remarkable, and would deserve record for its own sake. The difficulties of enumeration are almost insuperable. The Jewish origin of many professional, scientific, and artistic celebrities is often unknown and sometimes concealed even by themselves, and there is always the danger of wrongful inclusion or exclusion lest one do injustice either to Jews or to others. Here I have had practically no predecessors, and have had to perform the laborious

¹ The following may be mentioned as examples of such contributions from the outside: Hatch and Harnack on Church organization; Lecky and Schleiden on Jewish contributions to mediæval science; Stoeckl on the Jewish elements in mediæval mysticism; Burckhardt on the Renaissance; Sir Frederick Pollock on Spinoza; Diestel on the symbolic methods of mediæval exegesis.

INTRODUCTION

task of collecting together the Jewish celebrities with as much care and industry as I could bestow. Fortunately, this is a subject to which I have devoted considerable attention for the past thirty years, and have dealt with in a less complete fashion on two preceding occasions.¹

For, in my view, such an estimate of contemporary contributions to the world's progress is an essential part of the Jewish defence. Against the vague anti-Semitic denunciations of Jewish characteristics, which are mainly the results of prejudice and, in any case, cannot be checked or measured, we can here set down the definite results of Jewish achievement. We can even go further and, by the aid of modern statistical science as developed by Galton and Pearson, arrive at some measurable comparison between the output of Jewish ability and that of others. The science of probabilities even enables us to go further and to determine, with some precision, the probable proportions of Jews of different ranks of ability, which would otherwise not be measurable.

I have spoken above of the subjective or per-

¹ A comparative estimate of Jewish ability in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, 1887, and the section on Biography in my little volume on *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, a guide to its contents, 1906, pp. 90-110.

INTRODUCTION

sonal difficulties in the way of such an investigation as that which I am now outlining. I refer, of course, to the fact that this book, which has for its purpose to put forth the claims of the Jews to the world's recognition, emanates from one who is himself a Jew by race and training. It would be distasteful to make any such claims at all but that one is forced to do so in answer to the attacks of the anti-Semites. It would be even still more distasteful if one had to put forth any exclusive claims on the part of the Jews. What one chiefly objects to in Chamberlain's book is the arrogance and insolence of the exclusive claims that it advances on behalf of the "Teutonic" genius. No one would deny for a moment the magnificent contributions to the spiritual and material development of modern civilization made by "Teutons" (by which term, in the last resort, Mr. Chamberlain means Europeans in general); but to contend that no other race has ever made any contributions worth considering, nor can do so, owing to permanent racial inferiority, exceeds all the bounds of good taste and even good breeding. Mr. Chamberlain has pushed the conception of the Chosen Race beyond all bounds.

Modern men have arrived at a transvaluation

INTRODUCTION

of the notion of a Chosen Race which is at once more modest and more human. They have transformed it into the notion of Chosen Races, each with its own special characteristics, each, therefore, with a capacity to contribute something of its own to the treasure of human achievement. No race has a monopoly of any of the human qualities or capacities, but each has, by innate or acquired ability, some or other of these qualities in a more fully developed form. At appropriate moments of the world's history a race may influence others by its specific qualifications. To give a simple example, the whole of modern European art has been transformed by an acquaintance with the Chinese and Japanese notion of mass and tone "values" as revealed by the Goncourts.¹

It is a man's duty to learn for what part of the world's work he is best fitted by his original or acquired qualities; similarly every race with distinctive characteristics should learn to acquire self-knowledge of its own capacities, so that it

¹ I observe that, in tracing the modern revival of the dance in the negroid forms of the cake-walk, turkey-trot, and tango, writers like Dr. Havelock Ellis speak with full appreciation of the charm of a return to a frank enjoyment of the sensuous elements of life without any vilification of the Negro.

INTRODUCTION

can do the best for itself and for the world in developing those qualities likely to advance the cause of humanity and, of course, repressing any which are at all anti-social. They have a right to call upon their fellow-men to help them, so far as possible, in developing the former, in repressing the latter. I conceive, therefore, that I am doing nothing objectionable or in bad taste in attempting to ascertain from the achievements of my own people their special capacities to advance the world. The time may come when men, instead of reviling others for being different from them, would welcome such differences as likely to lead to new contributions to the world's advancement, while at the same time adding to the charms of social intercourse. Nothing leads to boredom more than uniformity of manners and thoughts.

Having these facts of Jewish influence before us, we may then be in a position to draw some conclusions as to the position of the Jew in the modern state. Granting the racial differences which have seemingly aroused so much ill-will, one may raise the question whether such sectional differences are not especially desirable in the modern state, the chief danger of which is

INTRODUCTION

a tendency to mediocre uniformity akin to Chinesism. There should be such a thing as division of labor in the spiritual as well as in the working world. It may be contended that the Jew is especially adapted for the modern Culture-State, whereas he was forcedly an alien element in the older Church-State, with its feudal fixity of classes and uniformity of creed. The higher anti-Semitism of modern times is, as we have seen, mainly the outcome of an attempted revival of the Church-State. In this connection the Jewish question is but one aspect of the final stand of the privileged classes of Europe to stem the forces of modern democracy.

In accordance with the above principles, I have divided the discussion of Jewish influence in the following pages into three books. In the first book I have endeavored to enumerate the Jewish contributions to civilization during the past two thousand years, showing that they have made themselves thereby a constituent element of that civilization to which they are equally heirs with other nations, creeds, and peoples. In the second book I have tried to evaluate the contributions of individual Jews to modern European culture in the immediate past and

INTRODUCTION

present. I have tried to avoid the chief danger of such enumerations by giving not only lists of names, which may be both confusing and misleading to the general reader, but also, as often as possible, giving the proportion of Jewish names in general lists, which is the only fair way of comparison. Finally, in the third book, I have essayed the difficult task of determining the value of Jews in the modern cultural state and thus to give an adequate answer to the question raised by the higher anti-Semites of to-day, who, in consonance with their mediæval ideals, are opposed to Jewish influence in the Church-State which they would like to see revived.

It will be found, I think, that I have discussed, at appropriate stages of the argument, all the anti-Semitic objections to Jews and their influence which are really deserving of mention. I must confess that I have not condescended to consider some of the cruder views of lower natures such as that all Jews are usurers or pitiless, or the like. No consideration will be found in these pages of the so-called blood accusation, which is merely a piece of mediæval folk-lore revived for sinister purposes. The

INTRODUCTION

only questions at issue to be discussed here are the extent and effect of Jewish influence throughout the ages and especially at the present time.

Our various discussions may bring out results of interest and value apart from their apologetic validity. If the thrice-tested facts of the Jewish superiority of intellectual output in Book II can be trusted, it would appear that the Jewish germ-plasm is a valuable asset in the world's treasure-house of character. I have shown, I think fairly conclusively, that there is a certain probability that a determinate number of Jews at the present time will produce a larger number of "geniuses" (whether inventive or not, I will not say) than any equal number of men of other races. It seems highly probable, for example, that German Jews at the present moment are quantitatively (not necessarily qualitatively) at the head of European intellect.¹ There are certain indications that those Russian Jews who have been released from Russian tyranny will show the same extent of capacity.

¹ Yet I can remember the time when the most contemptuous term which an English journalist could apply to any character was that of German Jew. The contributions of Beit, Mond, Speyer, and Cassel to the higher life of England have been a remarkable return for this depreciation.

INTRODUCTION

It is still a disputed point among anthropologists whether the common points of Jews are due to race or environment. Our results, so far as they go, seem to confirm those who contend for a common ancestry of contemporary Jews, since it is improbable that high ability of similar type should be so uniformly the outcome of much dissimilarity of environment. If this be so, the desirability of further propagation of the Jewish germ-plasm is a matter not merely of Jewish interest. In this connection the question of the high ability of the Jewish half-breeds, to which James Russell Lowell devoted so much attention, calls to be considered; at any rate, their existence, in large number, is sufficient to disprove Chamberlain's contention of the radical superiority of the German over the Jewish germ-plasm.

But modern students of heredity recognize three elements in the formation of a man's character—heritage, environment, and training. The question as to the origin of Jewish ability (which, after all, is generally recognized even by anti-Semites) has hitherto been exclusively discussed from one or other of the first two stand-points; it still remains to be considered whether much, if not most, of the Jewish capacity has

INTRODUCTION

not been produced by the special Jewish training in the home and in the synagogue. A long course of Jewish history has developed a special Jewish *ethos* which has created certain architectonic ideals distinctive of Jews. Some of these ideals, as embodied in the Bible, have already had their influence on civilized humanity; it remains to be seen whether others, which have hitherto been confined to the Jewish home, may not attract the sympathetic attention and imitation of the world, which is nowadays more than ever ready to learn from all quarters. It will thus be seen that the Jewish question is connected with numbers of others, both eugenic and euthenic, quite apart from the problems raised by the higher anti-Semites; I have endeavored, at times, in the following pages to touch upon these larger aspects quite apart from their bearing on the general lines of the Jewish defence. The Jewish question is in these various ways both practically and theoretically a world problem, as indeed the Hebrew prophets recognized with rare insight three thousand years ago. Isaiah's picture of the suffering Servant of the Lord might have been written to-day of Russian Israel.

BOOK ONE
JEWS OF THE PAST

CHAPTER I

THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK

THE Jews have been made what they are by the Bible, by which I mean, of course, what is usually termed the Old Testament. Their life has been dominated by its law, their feelings by its psalter, their ideals by its prophets, their outlook on life by its wisdom, and their hopes for the future by its apocalypse. When anti-Semites complain of the burden imposed upon the life of the Jew by the mass of talmudic technicalities they are unaware that, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand, these enactments are simply applications of the law of the Bible. The Mishnah and Gemara, which make up the Talmud, bear the same relation to the legal portions of the Pentateuch as the Digest to the Institutes of Gaius or Justinian. The prophets, it is true, found no successors in Israel for their remarkable amalgam of rhapsody and politics, but their spirit informed all

the higher thought of the nation till it ceased to be a nation, and has continued to inspire the higher spirits of the Jewish people ever since. The sweet singers of Israel did not cease with the Fifth Book of the Psalms. In the Psalms and Odes of Solomon, in the rhythms of the daily prayers, in the *Piyyutim* and *Selihot* of the mediæval hymnologists, the sacred poets of Israel carried on the tradition of the psalmist, more often than not spoiling their poetic effect by too closely clinging to the phraseology of their biblical predecessor. The practical sagacity with which the world has ever credited Jews has always been ennobled by touches of the higher biblical wisdom. Thus we find Glückel of Hameln interspersing her reflections on the state of business at Hamburg or the prospect of good matches for her children with pious acceptance of the decree of the Most High. Lastly, the apocalyptic visions of Ezekiel and Daniel found innumerable successors from Enoch to Herzl, all connecting the fate of the Jewish nation with the higher history of humanity. For over two thousand years the whole of Jewish literature—exegesis and legislation, hymnology and satire, philosophy and mysticism—centered

round and was derived from the Bible. If it be true, as it obviously is, that the Bible is a creation of the Jews, it is also true, though not so obvious, that the Jews are a creation of the Bible.

It was this intimate relation between book and people which enabled them to survive through all the vicissitudes of ancient, mediæval, and modern history. Throughout the ages the most convenient bond between men has been that of contiguity. In the vast majority of cases the land made the people, that is after they had settled down upon it in the agricultural stage. But there are two great exceptions to this rule in historic times. The Teutonic clans so impressed their character upon the lands to which they wandered that the very soil was named after the tribes—France, Normandy, England, Lombardy, Burgundy, and the like. The clans of Israel, or rather of Judah, after they were dispersed from Judæa, never became associated again with any definite land, but yet retained all that feeling of fellowship which goes to make up a people. That they did so was in large, almost in exclusive, measure due to the Bible. The Jews have indeed deserved the title

given to them by Muhammed, "The People of the Book."¹

But the book that has thus made the Jews what they are has also, in large measure, laid the foundation of European civilization. In all matters spiritual the Bible is the one common fountain-head of European thought and feeling, as, with perhaps Æsop's Fables, it is the only book which every European has read who has read any book. If, in Matthew Arnold's phrase, Hebraism rules the conduct of three-quarters of life (for most men he might have made it nine-tenths), for the majority of men it has been the Bible alone which has represented what the poet-critic calls Hebraism. In the Middle Ages, indeed, the remaining quarter of life, which is filled up with art and thought, was also mainly dependent upon the Bible for its influence. The beginnings of modern drama are to be found in the miracle plays, which, in all the cloisters of Europe, enacted the scenes of the Bible for the people who could not read it.² The Gregorian music which rolled through all the cathedral

¹ As a matter of fact, the term is applied in the Koran to any people or sect having a sacred Scripture, and thus includes Christians and "Sabæans" as well as Jews.

² See for details Chambers' *Mediæval Stage*, Oxford, 1903.

aisles of Europe has been traced back to the cantillations with which Jews recited the sacred text. Remove from the Old Masters their delineations of the biblical scenes, and there would not be much left of pre-Raphaelite art. Even in law, in which the genius of Rome was ultimately to exercise so supreme an influence on European legislation, the Bible in the beginnings had its word to say. Alfred's *Dooms* were prefaced with extracts from Leviticus adapted to the needs of Anglo-Saxon England, and in almost all the early Teutonic codes, when written down, were extracts from the pentateuchal codes which formed part of the record; nor must it be forgotten that the Digest in its final form is a Christian document and has undergone the influence of the Christian, which includes the Hebrew Scriptures. President Woodrow Wilson, in his treatise on the State, draws marked attention to this aspect:¹ "It would be a mistake, however, to ascribe to Roman legal conceptions an undivided sway over the development of law and institutions during the Middle Ages. The Teuton came under the influence, not of Rome only, but also of Christianity;

¹ Section 220.

and through the Church there entered into Europe a potent leaven of Judaic thought. The laws of Moses as well as the laws of Rome contributed suggestion and impulse to the men and institutions which were to prepare the modern world; and if we could but have the eyes to see the subtle elements of thought which constitute the gross substance of our present habit, both as regards the sphere of private life, and as regards the action of the state, we should easily discover how very much besides religion we owe to the 'Jew.'¹

Not alone has the Bible had influence upon European law, it has affected, even more strikingly, the law-making institutions of Europe. The constitutionalism of modern Europe, which we have seen spread in recent years to countries as remote from European modes of thought as China, Persia, and Turkey, can be distinctly traced back to the constitutional struggles of England in the seventeenth century, and everyone knows that at the back of the parliamentary

¹ Mr. Chamberlain, however, goes too far in suggesting that the universalistic element in Roman law is due to Semitic (he hints at Jewish) influence. Here, of course, he is working as usual for the nationalism of his party against any taint or tinge of universalism.

movement was the inspiration of ancient Israel. The Puritans carried their recognition of this influence so far as to load their children with unwieldy names taken or imitated from the Old Testament.¹ The appeal of both those who held to the divine right of kings and of those who were for a democratic government was, in both cases, to the Bible as the final authority in Commonwealth times.² Indeed the whole idea of the Reformation was to restore to the Bible the absolute authority in matters of religion and faith which, according to the Reformers, had been usurped by the popes. In Protestant lands, almost to the present day, a definite statement of the Bible on one side or the other of a disputed point was held, for most people, to settle the matter. If the influence of the Bible was strong in Old England, it was still stronger in New England in the seventeenth century, and even gave it a tendency toward Republicanism

¹ See Bardsley, *Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature*, London, 1879; which contains such specimens as Maher-shalhash-baz Smith; If-Christ-had-not-come-into-the-world-thou-hadst-been-damned Barbone (generally known, "for short," as Damned Barbone).

² See Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings*, second edition, London, 1914; Gooch, *History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge, 1898.

which was, in the next century, to lead to the dissolution of the bond between England Old and New.¹

It would perhaps be going too far to claim that the spread of modern Republicanism was due entirely to the Bible. The Swiss and Italian republics arose before the Bible, by means of the Reformation, had had so extensive an influence on political thought. But undoubtedly in Holland, in England, and in the United States the example of Israel winning its freedom from Pharaoh or opposing its own monarchs, when they attempted to force unpopular doctrines or actions upon it, was a strong force at the back of the stern Calvinists, who were the chief force in getting rid of tyrannous monarchy. The English Rebellion began with the cry: "To your tents, O Israel."

How deeply the Bible has sunk into the folk-soul of all Europeans is shown, perhaps, most conclusively by its ingrained influence upon the language of the peoples. Quite apart from the fact that the heroes of the Bible—Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Samson, Saul,

¹ See Oscar S. Straus, *Origin of Republican Form of Government*, New York, 1882.

David, Solomon, and the rest—have taken the place of the old mythical heroes of the Sagas and national legends, the phraseology of daily life in all European languages bears traces of biblical influence. Whenever we speak of “a land flowing with milk and honey,” “a still, small voice,” “a tale that is told,” “darkness which may be felt,” “vanity of vanities,” “law of the Medes and Persians,” “a wife of one’s bosom,” “an apple of one’s eye,” we are repeating biblical expressions. Whenever we “eat, drink, and be merry,” “take sweet counsel together,” “grind the faces of the poor,” “cause the widow’s heart to sing for joy,” “make a covenant with death,” “heap coals of fire,” and “be weighed in the balances and found wanting,” we are unconsciously plagiarizing the Hebrew Scriptures. Much of our popular wisdom comes from the same source, as, for example, “Put not thy trust in princes”; “Go to the ant, thou sluggard”; “Answer a fool according to his folly”; “A wise son maketh a glad father”; “Be not righteous over much”; “A soft answer turneth away wrath”; “The race is not to the swift”; “Love is strong as

death"; "In the multitude of counsellors there is safety"; "Righteousness exalteth a nation."

In the very fixation of the forms of a language the Bible has often had a critical influence. Our only record of the earliest stages of the Teutonic languages is given by Ulfilas' translations of the Gospels. Owing to the activities of the Bible societies, there are hundreds of dialects the only printed records of which consist of the translations of the Bible. Amid the warring struggles of the different German dialects for mastery, Luther's version of the Bible gave the victory to High German. We all know what effect King James' Version has had upon the English tongue, arousing even the envy of Roman Catholics, notwithstanding their doctrinal preference for the Douay Version.¹

I may perhaps best summarize the influence of the Bible on European culture by giving the Table of Contents of the admirable little book of Prof. E. von Dobschütz on "The Influence of the Bible on Civilization," which reached me in time for the revision of this chapter. He practically divides up the history of Christian

¹ See the eulogy of Cardinal Wiseman, quoted by Trench in his *English Past and Present*.

civilization into sections according to the attitude of men, during various periods, toward the Bible, as follows:

Chapter I. The Bible Makes Itself Indispensable for the Church (to 325 A.D.).

“ II. The Bible Begins to Rule the Christian Empire (325-600 A.D.).

“ III. The Bible Teaches the German Nations (500-800 A.D.).

“ IV. The Bible Becomes One Basis of Mediæval Civilization (800-1150 A.D.).

“ V. The Bible Stirs Non-Conformist Movements (1150-1450).

“ VI. The Bible Trains Printers and Translators (1450-1611).

“ VII. The Bible Rules Daily Life (1550-1850).

“ VIII. The Bible Becomes Once More the Book of Devotion.¹

Of course, Prof. Dobschütz is dealing with the New as well as the Old Testament, but most

¹ The same author's article on the "Bible in the Church," in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, deals with the subject topically rather than chronologically. It has, in addition, valuable bibliographies for each section.

of his remarks apply to both sections of the Canon. He shows how the blood of the martyrs, that became the seed of the Church, was mainly shed in defence of the Bible, possession of which was taken by the pagans as a sure sign of treason (I). Both in the Christian empire and among the Germans the Bible was made the basis of much legislation and still more of authoritative dogma (II and III). In the Middle Ages it gave rise to art and pilgrimages, besides the great sectaries (IV-V). Its influence on language, literature, and thought lasted on almost to the present day (VI, VII). While the Bible has lost its central position in European thought at the present time, Prof. Dobschütz contends that it will always form a basis for character formation among serious natures (VII). In all this discussion Prof. Dobschütz is speaking rather as a sociologist than a theologian, and leaves out of account, for the most part, the influence of the Bible on the subtleties of theology.

But it is not merely on the externalities of languages and institutions, closely as these may come home to the heart of the European peoples, that the Bible has left its deepest impress.

European religion, taken in its broadest sense, is the religion of the Bible. Putting aside, for the moment, the differences between the two Testaments, the religion of Israel freed mankind from that worship of Luck and Fate which is at the basis of all savagery. It recognized that human affairs and human character were ruled by high principles which soared above individual existence and bound men together in common allegiance to noble ends; it further connected each individual soul with the Source of these principles—the Ruler of the universe. Human nature was at once dignified by this notion of personal communion with the Highest Being, while at the same time it was deepened and solemnized by a sense of sin as treason toward the Spirit of the universe.¹

The very notion of a Kingdom of Heaven as distinct from the secular and mundane political state gave men an ideal toward which they might strive and, at the same time, a touch-

¹ There is some evidence that the later mysteries of Greek and Roman religion tended toward the same personal communion with the gods; but not all Greeks and Romans were initiates, and the essence of the official classic religions was outside the individual life. See, however, "Communion with Deity," in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*.

stone by which they could distinguish between law, morals, and other folk-ways. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Jews alone of ancient peoples conceived the notion of general progress in their Messianic conception. As has often been pointed out, Greeks and Romans look back upon the past as the golden age. The Jews alone look forward to the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven and its Messiah in the golden future. Nor was there any exclusiveness in the picture drawn of this future felicity. While regarding themselves, as all nations and sects do, as specially called upon to carry aloft their own ideals, they regarded their mission as fulfilled only when all the nations of the earth should be blessed in their seed.¹

But perhaps the profoundest influence that the Bible has exercised upon human thought and action has been the tender care for the bearers of the burden of humanity shown by both the Law and the Prophets. Everyone recognizes with Renan that the prophets were the first socialists. We recognize the kinship of Mazzini with Isaiah or Hosea, when he pleads the cause of the poor. But the spirit that animates

¹ Gen. 18, 18.

such a code as that contained in the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 21-23) is equally full of thought for the down-trodden, put into straight-forward legislation. If that code were fully carried out, even at the present day, there would not be so much murmuring and gnashing of teeth from below. If weights and measures were always true; if he that smiteth a man were surely put to death; if no bribe were taken; if the poor man's pledge were returned to him at eve; if the alien or the widow or the orphan were not vexed nor afflicted; if all damage done were made good; if the worker's wage were never kept from him, and so on, the evils of a capitalistic system would be much reduced.

When confining our estimate of the influence of the Bible to the Old Testament, as we must do for the present purpose, we have to leave out of account the appeal of the motive of the life beyond the grave, which has had so much influence in modern religion. It is perhaps the most striking characteristic of the Old Testament that it practically makes no appeal to this motive. There are slight traces of a belief in a future life, dim and unattractive as this may be; but no prophet, no psalmist appeals to its

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

existence as a reason for living the higher life and obeying the high motive. Later on, under the influence of Persia, Jews acquired the notion of Paradise as a counterbalance to the conception of Sheol, and then made the two appeals more stringent and effective; but in the Old Testament itself the appeal is never made, and we cannot, therefore, reckon it in when estimating the influence of what we have called the Bible on European civilization.

The influence of the Bible on European culture reaches its culmination, of course, in its monotheism. The worship of the One Lord of the universe has now become so ingrained in the European mind that it is difficult to realize the reverence paid to the multitude of local deities which characterized the classical world. It is true that in the more modern worship of saints we have something analogous to the more ancient reverence for local deities. It is also true that in the development of Greek thought and in the syncretism of the great empires a tendency grew to recognize One Supreme Being, so that in theory the world was prepared for acceptance of the One God. But while the saints may possibly be regarded as survivals of

the old local deities, they are never regarded, even by the most superstitious, as of equal rank with the Most High, and, on the other hand, the more philosophic pagans, even down to the Emperor Julian, still regarded the minor deities of the Pantheon as possessing noumenal existence. Without the Bible and Bible religion Europeans would, so far as we know, still be worshipping the gods, probably by animal sacrifices.

This obvious truth appears to be a source of irritation to many proud "Aryans." From Lassen and Renan to Delitzsch and Chamberlain, they seek to minimize, in one way or another, the debt they are forced to acknowledge to Israel for teaching them to worship the One God. Renan's peculiar and bizarre thesis was that monotheism is simply an instinct of a desert folk as all Semites originally were, who had, therefore, nothing visible to worship in the wide expanse of the sandy desert which represented for them the Infinite. Monotheism in this sense, far from being the highest form of religion, is, according to Renan, merely the minimum of faith, the most negative form of the worship of the ideal. Renan's views in this regard have been driven out of the court of critical opinion

mainly by the consideration that not all Semites were monotheistic, but only the Israelites, and that the characteristic of the monotheism of Israel is its ethical character;¹ only in Israel do we find united the lordship of the two worlds, which aroused Kant's awe—"the starry heavens above, the moral law within."

Of recent years, however, the attempt has been made by Prof. Delitzsch, of Berlin, to declare that this ethical monotheism was not original with Israel, but existed among the Babylonians, from whom it is thereby asserted that the Israelites obtained the sublime notion. The myths and legends of the early chapters of Genesis have been shown to be, in almost every case, similar to, and therefore probably derived from, analogous portions of Chaldaic mythology. But, as Prof. Morris Jastrow has ably shown, in every case the form given to the myth by the biblical narrators is distinctly imbued with the specific ethical monotheism of the Hebrews. Thus in the myth of Creation the Babylonian

¹ Steinthal points out very pertinently that not alone some of the nomad Semites (after Muhammed) but also some of the noblest Greek philosophers were monotheists (*Ueber Juden und Judenthum*, Berlin, 1910, p. 94). Had the latter but a minimum of religion?

account remains always on the level of the nature-myth, whereas the biblical account removes the element of conflict between the different gods, and makes the whole creation the outcome of a Spirit anterior even to light.¹ The Jews borrowed the material of the Creation and other similar myths from the Babylonians, it is true; but the form they gave in every case was their own, and whether the fundamental religious views of the Hebrews were derived from the Babylonians or not scarcely affects the fact that European civilization derived its fundamental faith from the Jews.

One scarcely understands this reluctance to admit indebtedness for ideals to external sources. A people or a nation works out its own ideals to the extreme limit, and then can only hope for expansion or improvement of them by cross-fertilization with the ideals of others, with which they are at first not so much in sympathy.² This

¹ M. Jastrow, *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions*, New York, 1914, chapter II.

² In the education of the human race, to use Lessing's noble conception, we cannot proceed otherwise than in the pædagogics of an individual. When I was a teacher, and one of my pupils declared that he couldn't stand Euclid, I always used to say: "That's the very proof that you need training in geometry, for it is there that your mental capacity is obviously weakest."

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

is true of the highest as of the lowest forms of culture. The Mongols of China and Japan have been mainly influenced in their religious thought by the Aryan religion of Buddha. The Hamites of Africa have recognized the highest that could appeal to them in the Islam of Semitic Arabia. The Hebrews themselves, in post-biblical times, were clearly influenced by the angelology and demonology of Persia. Why should it be thought anomalous or beneath the dignity of Europeans to have supplemented their own ideals by adopting for their highest idealism the religion of Israel? Steintal draws apt attention to a parallel influence of Semites on an Aryan people in the remarkable Renaissance which came to Persia after its conquest by the Arabs. Persian art, as we know—its textiles, its pottery, its illuminations—was entirely due to this Semitic Renaissance. The Persian language was re-made under Arabic influence; the great Persian epic of Firdausi is of this period, and the mystic poets, Sadi and the rest, are a felicitous combination of Aryan and Semite.¹ I would add that Persia showed equal powers of

¹ See my Introduction to *The Rose Garden of Persia*, London, 1898.

influencing Islam, which owed to it the Barmecides and probably the "Arabian Nights," as well as the one great Islamic heresy. Mr. Murray, in his *History of Chess*,¹ points out that it was Persian armies that placed the Abbasids on the throne, that the whole organization of the state was Persian, and, he adds, that the history of Muslim Chess is largely the history of Persian players. The more we study the history of civilization the more we find this give-and-take of different cultures as the necessary condition for its development. Why, then, should Chamberlain & Co.² object to recognizing a certain indebtedness of European culture to Jewish influence in religion?

How Europe has repaid this indebtedness to Israel need not be here touched upon. I am more concerned to state that there has never been any claim by Jews for any such payment; nor would such claim be justified. Nor would it be politic; gratitude to one individual for favors received is nominally tempered by resentment against the scheme of things which

¹ P. 158.

² Whenever I speak of Chamberlain & Co., I refer to points which Mr. Chamberlain shares with many predecessors. Those peculiar to himself are referred to under his own name.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

causes the necessity for receiving favors. If Mr. Popakopoulus, who does me the honor to blacken my shoes occasionally, attempts to scamp his work or cheat me out of my change, I am not inclined to regard his lapses with more leniency because he may possibly have within his veins some of the blood of an Æschylus or a Plato. So, too, if Pietro Vivanti sells me inedible fruit or does not carry through a piece of work he has agreed to do, I should remain unaffected by his pleadings (which he is scarcely likely to make) that he is descended from Lucretius or Horace. Just in the same way Mr. Abramsky, or Mr. Isaacstein, or let us even say Mr. Jacobs, has no diploma entitling him to do inefficient work or a piece of underhand trickery because he may be a direct descendant of Samuel or Hosea. In fact, in all these cases, the possession of so illustrious a pedigree only creates the greater disappointment if its possessors fall short of the current standards of manners or morals found in the ordinary citizen. *Noblesse oblige* should be the slogan of noble races as well as of noble families.

No, the claim the Jews have upon Europe, owing to their special relation to the Bible, is

something other and more important from our present point of view. Europe has learnt from the Jewish Bible the fundamentals of social justice and righteousness as part of its religion. When, therefore, Jews knock at the doors of Europe and claim, as they are doing, social recognition after they have obtained political equality, they may fairly say: "You and we are brothers in spirit, we are both sons of the Book." Chamberlain & Co. are always reiterating the charge that the Jews are Orientals camped in Europe. But so great has been the influence upon European culture in its fundamental aspects by ancient Israel that we might almost transpose the relation and say, as has indeed been said, that the ancient Israelites were Europeans encamped in Western Asia. Whether due to the influence of the Bible or not, there is more spiritual affinity between Germans and the Israelites of the Bible than between the Israelites and, say, Egyptians or Assyrians.¹ When Max Müller planned his *Sacred Books of the East*,

¹ The Teutonic tone of the Books of Samuel is indeed noteworthy in this regard. At one time I had thought of translating the Septuagint version of Samuel (which is fuller in several places) under the title "The Saga of King David and King Saul."

he consciously or unconsciously gave a Western position to the Bible by omitting it from his list. Indeed, when one turns over the weary, dreary pages of these volumes, the contrast both as literature and as inspiration is indeed striking. Mr. Chamberlain, who so frequently insists upon the superiority of the Indo-Teuton religion, ought, as a punishment, to be compelled to read through the whole of the fifty volumes of the Sacred Books of the East.

Chief among the contrasts which differentiate the Bible from the other Sacred Books of the East is the notion of progress, which is so essentially European and incidentally, I may say, prophetic. Bagehot used to insist upon the extreme rarity of the notion of progress in the history of humanity. Savages regard what is as the norm; they cannot conceive of change either in the past or the future. As against this, the Hebrew prophets, with splendid indignation, regarded the present condition of their nation as abominable, and felt a confident hope that the divine plan of the universe involved an amelioration not alone for themselves but for the whole world.

Now in the divine plan of the prophets there

were two elements which distinguished the Hebraic ideals from those of all others and which have extorted the imagination and admiration of Europe. The first of these is the idealization of the poor and suffering as the type of the good man.¹ The Bible is emphatically on the side of the "under-dog," and in prophetic diction God is mainly regarded as the Protector of the poor. This is against the whole spirit of classical antiquity, which regards the *Kalokagathos* as the ideal man, and always regards the gods as fighting on the side of the winners in life's battles. Indeed, though Europe has nominally accepted the Hebraic idealization of the poor and has done heroic work of recent years on the divine plan of the Hebrew prophets, yet it has been on the whole against the grain, and the natural tendency of the natural man is to applaud and to admire the rich and strong. Nietzsche, as is well known, developed a whole anti-Gospel on these lines.

The second unexpected ideal of the Hebrew prophets is that which holds up peace as the final aim of humanity. This ideal again is far

¹ See Isidore Loeb, *La Religion des Pauvres dans la Bible*, Paris, 1892.

from being congenial to the European or even to the Indo-European character. The warrior is the ideal type among Brahmins, Homeric Hellenes, Romans, Celts, and Vikings. The *charmé* or battle-joy of the Greeks and the Berserkir rage of the Vikings illustrate what I mean.¹ Even to the present day the soldier is the idol of the populace, and men who profess the Gospel of the Prince of Peace have not been ashamed to advocate a gospel of war. Whenever an additional subsidy was needed in the Reichstag, Moltke would dilate upon the ennobling and self-sacrificing character of the soldier's life, and his successor, Von der Goltz, has written down a veritable gospel of war in his *Nation in Arms*.²

Yet though Europe has only imperfectly assimilated the Jewish ideals of poverty as spiritual

¹ My friend, Prof. R. G. Moulton, points out, in the Introduction to his *Modern Readers' Bible*, that the war idea is kept alive nowadays by reading the Greek and Roman classics and literature derived from them; he considers Bible readings would be an antidote.

² Even Robert Louis Stevenson, in an interview he once gave at San Francisco, declared that he did not see the superiority of the slow deaths caused by commercial competition over the quick and honorable departure from the world on the battlefield. Only in these latter days are men gradually being convinced of the iniquity of war by its disastrous effects upon the Stock Exchange (Norman Angell).

riches and of peace as the international goal, after all it has accepted these aims as part of the notion of progress, which it took over in large measure from the Hebrew Bible. Certainly there is no incongruity in Europe accepting Jews into its spiritual brotherhood because of its imperfect acceptance of the ideals of poverty and peace. There are movements on either side which, at any rate in regard to the former ideal, have made an approximation easy. St. Francis took poverty for his bride, and made it the badge of his friars, while Jews, on the other hand, have, from historic and human reasons, laid aside a good deal of the old Hebraic admiration for poverty, emphasizing rather the very human view of biblical wisdom that wealth should be the reward of virtue.

I have laid stress upon the identity of ideals among modern Europeans and modern Jews owing to their common derivation from the ideals of the Hebrew Bible, because, as it seems to me, this is the dominating fact in discussing what is known as the Jewish question. This, in the last resort, is raised by the doubts cast by the higher anti-Semites whether Jews have sufficiently the same ideals to be received within

the higher culture of Europe and America without danger to that culture. If indeed there were such fundamental differences of ideals between Jews and others,¹ there might be something in the "cultural menace," of which some academic anti-Semites in America speak so glibly when talking of Jews. Cultures can only cross-fertilize when they are sufficiently alike to form part of the same species. If they are absolutely incongruous, however perfect each may be in its own way, any attempt to combine the two must necessarily result in failure. Take the case of the Japanese. From what I have seen, heard, and read of the Japanese nation, they have a sensitiveness of honor (Bushido), an intensity of patriotism, a joyousness of outlook upon life, a refined courtesy which, in each aspect, surpasses the stage reached by Europeans.² Yet in my opinion it would be dangerous, if not impossible, to implant the same ideals and tendencies among Europeans, who, owing to the absence of a common historic foun-

¹ On the actual difference of ideals, see next chapter, "The Church and the Jews."

² In judging of the Japanese character I have had the advantage of enjoying the friendship of my college chum, Baron Dairoku Kikuchi.

dation, must always regard Japanese and Chinese as alien, not alone in race and nationality, but also in culture. With the Jews it is different; the foundations for the two cultures concerned are the same, and, as we shall see, the structures reared upon these foundations during the last two thousand years have been, in large measure, identical, except in so far as this has been prevented by ecclesiastical tyranny. Both Europeans and Jews have claim to the title of the People of the Book.

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

IN the preceding chapter we have seen that the fundamental conceptions of European civilization—the notion of social progress through righteousness and the solemnization of life through the idea of personal communion with the divine—have been derived both by Jews and Gentiles from the Old Testament, which thus becomes a spiritual bond between them. But it is not alone merely the outlines of this civilization which are common to Jew and Gentile; many of the details are identical, and for the same reason, because derived from the folkways of ancient Israel. During the first fifteen Christian centuries the culture of Christendom was, in large measure, created by the Church, and both in creed and ritual the undivided Western Church, in its beginnings and largely throughout its career, was Jewish in form and tone.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

This is seen both in ritual and in institutions, as well as in doctrine. The Common Prayer, both of Church and Synagogue, is based upon the Psalter, "the hymn-book of the Second Temple." When one speaks of a *Te Deum* or a *Magnificat*, a *Miserere*, or *In exitu Israel*, the reference is to the Psalms of the Vulgate as used in the Roman Church.¹ The Trisagion of the Greek Church is merely the *Kedushah* of the Jewish service, itself derived from the angelic respond of *Is. 6, 3*. The central function of the Church service, the mass (or in Protestant churches the communion), derives its "elements," in the last resort, from the wine and unleavened bread used at the home service of the Passover, and Bickell has shown that the original ritual of the mass is derived from that of the Seder service in Jewish homes on the first night of the Passover.² The First and Second Lessons of the Church, derived respectively from the Old and New Testaments, are simply an imitation of the practice of the Synagogue to read

¹ On the general influence of the Psalms on Christian life and thought, see Prothero, *The Psalms in History and Biography*, in "Everyman's Library."

² *Messe und Pascha*, 1872; English translation, *The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual*, London, 1892.

sections from the Law and the Prophets every sabbath. There are even indications that at an early stage the same passages were read in both places of worship at the same period of the year.¹

Churches are "oriented" because synagogues had their holy ark against the eastern walls so that worshippers might face towards Jerusalem. The eastern position of the priest, over which such violent controversies have arisen in the Church, is due to the same cause. The vestments of priests and bishops can be traced back to those of the Israelite priests. The font of baptism is immediately derived from the *Mikweh*, or ritual bath of Jewish practice, though now only used in the Church for new-born infants. The Church altar represents, in position and significance, the holy of holies of the Jewish Tabernacle and Temple. The position of the pulpit recalls that of the "Bimah," from which the Jewish homilist of talmudic times used to utter his expository or consoling words. Anointing was a Jewish custom long before it was a Christian one; indeed, the word "Messiah" simply means "anointed," as does its Greek equivalent.

¹ See my article, *Triennial Cycle*, in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. xii.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

lent "Christ." The notion of church asylum is clearly derived from that of the cities of refuge in the Levitical scheme.

The Church owes nearly as much of its institutions to Jewish example as of ritual and ceremonial. Thus Hatch has shown that, in all probability, the bishop derives from the *gabbai* or treasurer or "overseer" (hence the name "Episcopus") of the synagogue. One may even conjecture that the peculiar form of the episcopal blessing with two erect fingers is merely a modification of the priestly blessing with hand uplifted and the fingers separated in pairs. The elders of the Church are but a duplicate of the elders of the Synagogue. Visiting the sick was one of the recognized modes of Jewish corporal charity long before it became a characteristic of Christian philanthropy. It is still a matter of dispute whether hospitals did not originate among Jews. But there can be little doubt that the charity boxes of churches came from the same practice in the synagogues. Simon ben Shetah established religious schools among Jews long before there is any trace of Sunday-schools among Christians. The whole method of ordination of priests is a direct descendant of the

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Semikah or laying on of hands of Jewish practice, which gave the power to "bind and loose" just as in the Christian Church. The missionary character of early Christianity was only a repetition of the missionary spirit of the Judaism of the time which Harnack grants was a preparation for the Christian mission.¹ Even the Canon Law of the Church has not been without influence from Jewish sources.² To quote but one example: The tables of forbidden relations are, in the main, derived from the Levitical laws about incest, and it is well known that the objection to marrying a deceased wife's sister was based upon Leviticus 19.³

But it is not alone in the externalities of ritual and institutions that this dependence of Christianity on Judaism can be traced; the fundamental ideas of the theologies of both religions are practically identical. "The Kingdom of Heaven" is so essentially a Jewish conception that few outsiders, who use the expression, are aware of its exact meaning. So scrupulous

¹ *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, vol. i, p. 55.

² Aptowitzer, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, *New Series*, vol. i, p. 217, *seq.*; vol. ii, p. 55, *seq.*

³ Lagarde, *The Law Not to Marry a Deceased Wife's Sister*, Leyden, 1878.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

were Jews in avoiding the use of the word "God" that they utilized various euphemisms in its stead, among which the favorite expression was "Heaven"; the "Kingdom of Heaven" is, therefore, merely the Jewish equivalent for the Kingdom of God. It has been well said that the chief ideas that ruled the Middle Ages can be traced back to Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, which is only a Latin form of the Jewish conception of the "Kingdom of Heaven." Dr. Tennant has developed several interesting treatises showing that the Christian notion of Original Sin is almost entirely derived from Jewish conceptions, though it must be allowed that it has received much more elaborate development in Church doctrine. This is probably due to the fact that in Judaism this rather harsh and one-sided conception was modified by the parallel doctrine of what the Rev. S. Levy has aptly termed Original Virtue, by which the offspring of virtuous parents have a kind of super-added merit; the special Hebrew term is "the merit of the fathers."¹ As a counterpart to these notions which are, after all, only the theological

¹ See S. Levy, *Original Virtue, and Other Short Studies*, London, 1907.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

counterpart of the biological notion of heredity, Jewish theology, even in Bible times, has developed the idea of God's Grace as vouchsafed to his special favorites, though here again it must be allowed that Christian theologians have expanded the notion into innumerable side-channels which come to a head, not alone in Calvinism, but in the Jansenism of Port Royal. But the original germ is there in the Synagogue. The Fatherhood of God is a commonplace of Hebrew thought, nor is the analogous conception of the Son of God altogether alien to Jewish notions. The idea of a Chosen People, so obnoxious to many Christians, was taken over bodily by early Christians, who, as Harnack has shown,¹ regarded the world as created for their sakes, just as Jews had previously done.²

The close connection of Church and Synagogue in matter of belief is nowhere more strikingly shown than in their eschatology. As was mentioned in the last chapter, the Old Testament shows little interest in the life after death, but between the two Testaments the Jews acquired from the Persians a deep interest in the future of

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² IV Ezra, vi, 54-9, edit. Charles, ii, 579.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

the soul, as well as a whole system of angelology and demonology connected with this conception. The vague conception of Sheol as the abode of the dim ghosts of the dead became intensified into the notion of Gehenna (itself a Jerusalem locality where garbage was burned) which, in contrast to the Persian Paradise, was regarded as the abode of sinful souls. The resurrection of the dead at the day of last judgment thus became added to Jewish hopes and fears; the Angel of Death became a prominent feature of Jewish mythology. All this was taken over by the Church, which even improved the occasion by emphasizing the terrors of Hell. The deepened sense of the consequences of sin, which was thus brought about, led to further developments of the doctrine of Atonement, already conspicuous in Old Testament theology. Mr. Montefiore has pointed out that the notion of Repentance, as the necessary preliminary to Atonement, is characteristically Jewish and that in this regard Jesus was more Jewish than "Christian."¹ Confession of sin as a proof of Repentance is again a Jewish practice which was developed by the Church into one of its most characteristic institu-

¹ *Jewish Quarterly Review*, xvi, pp. 209-257.

tions. At the same time was developed a notion of mental diseases being produced by demons which could be exorcised by powerful personalities and their disciples, a notion which was taken up in its entirety in the New Testament.¹ The use of charms and amulets developed from this notion both among Jews and Christians.

It is needless to remark that the whole notion of a Messiah is Jewish in origin, as the name indeed indicates.² The main question between the two creeds was whether the often discordant elements, which could be discerned in the biblical utterances about the Messiah, were "fulfilled" in Jesus; but there was never any doubt about the origin of the idea itself. Jews, for the most part, laid stress upon the victorious aspects of the Redeemer; Christians, for obvious reasons, emphasized his identity with the Suffering Servant of the Lord.³ As it turned out, the latter "prophecy" was destined to be more literally fulfilled by the people of Israel than by the Man Jesus.

¹ See F. C. Conybeare in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, viii, 587, *seq.*

² See above, p. 92.

³ Is. 53.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

In considering the claims of the Man of Nazareth, Christian theologians find more and more difficulty in distinguishing the doctrines he puts forth from those to be deduced from the Old Testament or from its Apocrypha. The Kingdom of Heaven and the Fatherhood of God are, as we have seen, commonplaces of older Hebrew thought. Jesus himself bases his whole system on the Shema¹, and the command to love one's neighbor as one's self, taken from Leviticus 19, 18, or in so many words, on ethical monotheism which is the fundamental Jewish position. The Golden Rule, it is well known, had been put forth, though in a negative and more practical form, before the time of Jesus by Hillel in the mere enunciation of the principle; and it may be here remarked that both had been anticipated by Confucius. The Sermon on the Mount has been shown to be a *rechaûffée* of current Pharisaic doctrine,² while the Lord's Prayer is a cento from the Jewish 'Amidah, being a shortened form of five of the original six of the "Eighteen Blessings," and one of its phrases, "deliver us

¹ Deuteronomy, 6, 4.

² See G. Friedlander, *Origin of the Sermon on the Mount*, London, 1909.

from the evil one," is only comprehensible by reference to the special Jewish conception of the Yezer ha-Ra', or Evil Inclination.¹ The notion that Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath was not original with Jesus, and his whole attitude toward the Law was by no means unusual at his time. He risked and earned death in order to fulfil the commands of the Torah, to keep the Passover in Jerusalem. No wonder that he himself declared that he had come not to annul but to fulfil the Law,² and modern theologians can only point vaguely to his personality as the sole differentia of primitive Christianity from developed Judaism.

So close was the identification of the two in the early ages of Christianity that there are numbers of documents which the most learned Christian theologians cannot even to this day determine whether they belong to one or the other. Thus, to take a recent example, the Odes of Solomon, discovered by Prof. Rendell Harris in Syriac, are declared by him to be specifically

¹ See C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 1st edition, p. 142.

² Matthew 2, 17, which is quoted in the Talmud, Shabbat 116 b; compare *ibid.*, 18.

Christian, whereas the even greater authority of Harnack declares for their Jewish tone. One of the earliest of Christian documents, the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which was used as a catechism for Christian disciples, has been shown to be, in its first part, merely an expansion of a similar work for Jewish neophytes entitled "The Two Ways." The Didascalia or Apostolic Constitutions of the early Church are full of Jewish elements, as are the Clementine Epistles. In the New Testament itself, the Revelation of St. John has been recently discovered to be an expansion of a Jewish apocalypse. It is well known that the Logos of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel is directly derived from the thought of Philo, while St. Luke shows acquaintance with, and utilizes the historic knowledge of, Josephus. In several of these instances there is a certain amount of doubt whether the document is definitively Jewish or Christian, but the fact that such doubt could arise in the minds of capable students of early Christianity is sufficient for the point I am here making of the substantial agreement, if not identity, of the two creeds in most theological fundamentals.

The same doubt exists about some of the early

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Christian heresies, as, for instance, the Ebionites. Montanism is declared by Renan to be an essentially Jewish heresy, while the relation of Millenarianism to the Book of Daniel is obvious on the face of it. No wonder that as late as 380 the Christians of Antioch went to synagogue as a matter of course, and St. John Chrysostom upbraids his hearers for doing the same.

The practical identity of the two creeds was so striking, especially to the outer world, that the Church had to go out of its way to invent differences in practice. The earliest of these was the transference of the Sabbath to the Sunday, which to this day troubles the conscience of the Seventh Day Baptists. The great Council of Nicæa took elaborate steps to prevent Easter from falling upon the same day as Passover in order to distinguish the two. As we have seen earlier, as soon as it obtained the supremacy, the Church put a stop to any identification of the two creeds by barring commensality and intermarriage and taking steps to degrade the social status of the Jew. The very intensity of its hatred showed the nearness of the danger (and of the doctrines); it was a family quarrel.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

No doubt there were differences of belief and practice, as well as the identities which I have thus emphasized (for the first time, so far as I am aware, in such detail). The rejection of the Law by Pauline Christianity at once put a barrier between the two offshoots of Hebraism. The image worship, which the early Church adopted from the pagan world, was especially obnoxious to the Jewish consciousness. The combined socialism and Orphic mystery of the early Christian love-feasts (*Agapæ*) is a new departure which, after all, scarcely established itself even in the Church; the "kiss of peace," its sole survival, was a Jewish practice; above all, the doctrine of the Man-God (and its corollary, the Virgin birth) was a distinct contribution of Hellenism, and was utterly alien to Jewish notions, which have repudiated them consistently from that day to this. For this repudiation of the crucial distinction between Christianity and Judaism Jews were soon excluded from Christian fellowship. As early as 306 the laws of the Church debarred the faithful from marrying or even eating with Jews. They were soon prevented from bearing witness, true or false, against Christians, and by 538 they were

forbidden to exercise any authority over true believers, whether as public officials or as private masters. Considering the closeness of the two religions, both in creed and practice, it is not difficult to understand these ecclesiastical enactments as precautions against confusion between the two faiths on the part of the pagans. What is rather difficult to understand is the endorsement by the state of the principle that all members of the state must be members of the State-Church. It is possible that the spread of the Arian heresy and its results may have predisposed statesmen towards this remarkable policy, which has had such disastrous results not alone for Jews but for all citizens, since it has made uniformity of doctrine a test of state service. They may have observed that, in cases like Spain and Lombardy where the rulers were Arians and the subjects Catholics, the State fell into anarchy and was, in Spain, conquered by the unbelievers. As a contrast to this they observed the uniform success of the Franks, who were Catholics, from the king to his meanest subjects. Once adopted as a state policy, all the force of the Church was naturally devoted to keeping the principle intact, which made the

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

Church the arbiter and ruling principle of the State.

In this connection the position of the Jews in the mediæval Church-State was indeed remarkable in many respects. It is generally regarded nowadays, both by Christians and Jews, as the typical example of persecution of creed. In reality it is the first great example of toleration in Church policy after the Catholic idea of repudiation of heresy within the state had prevailed. Contrast the case of an Albigeois of Narbonne with a Jew of the same city at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The former, because he doubted the Virgin birth of Christ or held divergent views as to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, would be condemned to the flames, whereas the Narbonne Jew was allowed to live on, with life and property secure, so far as the Church was concerned, though he equally repudiated the Virgin birth and didn't even profess to acknowledge the existence of the Holy Ghost. The object of the Church in making this contrast was, of course, not due to any desire to encourage free thought. The Jews were to be kept alive as living witnesses to the

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Passion and proofs of Holy Writ.¹ At the same time they were to be prevented from enjoying power or wealth, so that their infidelity would carry with it its obvious punishment as an example to all men.

Now, in principle, the anti-Semites of to-day seek to revive the Jewish disabilities of the mediæval Church-State, because most of them wish to revive the Church-State. It matters not that with Mr. Chamberlain the Church which is thus to be thrust into power again is the Lutheran Protestant with the vaguest of dogmas, while with M. Drumont it is the Catholic Church with all its dogmatisms that would regain that position. They can scarcely hope any longer to restore the Church-State of the Middle Ages in its entirety and force all citizens to be of one creed, but they do desire that their own theological views, as embodied in their own Church, should have a predominant influence upon legislation. They attack the Jews as the most prominent example of non-agreement with the Established Church (Lutheran in Prussia, Catholic formerly in France). But Mr. Chamberlain is almost equally adverse to Cath-

¹ St. Bernard; see below, p. 128.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

olics as to Jews; Drumont, or, at any rate, his party, was aiming probably even as much at Protestants as at Jews.

It is indeed difficult to see how they can hope, in any way, to effect their object of excluding modern Jews from the modern State. They could only do this by insisting upon a certain uniformity of belief from all citizens; and so great have been the inroads of agnosticism and modernism that any principle excluding Jews would, in all probability, exclude even larger circles of Christians. For it is notorious that just in those points in which Jews theologically differ from their Christian fellow-citizens the modern world is at last coming around to the Jewish attitude. The older view, which regarded every utterance of the Old Testament as cryptically pointing toward one or the other of the utterances or exploits of Jesus, is entirely exploded. The notion of direct prophecy by texts of the Old Testament of the coming and detailed acts of Jesus is equally antiquated.¹ A celebrated example is the well-known alleged prophecy of the Virgin birth in Isaiah 7, 14,

¹ See Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecies of Israel*, London, 1878.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

which, as Dr. Skinner remarks in his comments on the passage, in the Cambridge Bible, is now given up in favor of the Jewish view. Isaiah 53 is no longer regarded even by Christian theologians as a direct prophecy of Jesus, but rather of the nation of Israel in personified form.¹ The difficulties of Trinitarianism are ever on the increase, and there is a marked apologetic tone, in the dyslogistic sense of that word, in the defenders of the Virgin birth.² If all are to be excluded from the full privileges of citizenship who do not believe in the Trinity or the Virgin birth, Jews will not be the only sufferers.

Whatever may be the religious future of humanity in the immediate future, Jews are in an exceptionally fortunate position to meet the inevitable changes. If there is a revival of faith, it will doubtless affect them as much as others; indeed there are signs that the world is beginning to be willing to listen to Jewish teachers in matters of religion. One might

¹ See Robinson, *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*, New York, 1913, p. 176.

² See J. Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, New York, 1907, to which I contributed a paper (sadly mutilated in publication) on the Jewish aspect of the subject.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

even predict that a revival of Messianism among Jews would meet with a wide sympathy among Christians. Again, if science makes even wider conquests in the religious sphere than it has done hitherto, it by no means follows that Judaism may not survive the scientific triumph. Its two fundamental doctrines, the Unity of God and the Messianic Hope, could easily be transvaluated into scientific terms, as James Darmesteter once pointed out. Science is, with each advancing stage of its progress, insisting upon the unity of all forms of energy, while scientific philanthropy is looking forward to an era when poverty will be no more,¹ and when peace will be assured by the impossibility of gaining anything by war,² or, in other words, when the two requirements of the Messianic Age will be fulfilled. Even if the depressing prophecy of Guyau as to the "non-religion" of the future be fulfilled, Jews, to say the least, can be as non-religious as others, and *cadit quæstio judaica*. Already they have shown, in the Ethical Culture movement, that they are prepared for such a deplorable consummation of their great history.

¹ See J. H. Hollander, *The Abolition of Poverty*, 1914.

² Norman Angell.

It is indeed remarkable that just when Jews are at last free to practise and, if they desire it, to propagate their faith, they should find it undermined from without by the Higher Criticism of Christians and within by the Ethical Culture of Jews.

Whatever may be the future of what may be termed theological religion, there is little doubt that it will take up less and less space in men's thoughts compared with what it did in the Middle Ages, when everything was tinged with theological speculation. The trend of the age is away from dogmatic belief. Amiel was right in saying that the days of the over-sure in things spiritual was over. When so many men of distinction and brilliant parts doubt the very existence of personal communion between man and the Supreme Being of the universe, it would be nugatory to lay stress upon unessential differences about the metaphysical constitution of that Supreme Being. This idea gives an air of unreality to theological speculation of all kinds, which accounts for the apologetic tone now predominant in works on theology of all schools. And if theology be discredited, it is difficult to see how Jews can suffer civic discrimination on any theological grounds.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

Outside theology, the elements of modern civilization are open equally to Jew as to Christian, and one of the most marked characteristics of the past century has been the eagerness with which they have entered into possession of them. In literature, in art, in science, and in practical life, the Jew has taken his full share in modern culture, and compared with these the theological side of men's lives is rapidly shrinking. Thus, in the theological sphere, the points of conflict between Jew and Gentile have become less and less; the points of communion are, for reasons just indicated, increasing as the ages go past; and at the same time, outside theology, there is an ever-increasing sphere of spiritual activity in which Jews can and do join with equal right as any of their fellow-citizens.

I am aware that the higher anti-Semites, like Mr. Chamberlain, will insist that the theological differences that still remain are of the highest importance in questions of idealism in human intercourse. The devil can quote Browning for his purpose:

The little more and how much it is;
The little less and how far away!

And with regard to all social matters this canon is especially applicable. The slightest difference of accent or of manner may be repellant in social intercourse and may make one select or reject this one or that as one's chosen comrade. But the point I am making now is that it is practically impossible that, in a modern state, theological differences, such as divide Jews from Gentiles, can any longer be made the basis of political disqualifications. And provided that political equality is secured to the Jews, they can safely let social equality work itself out in due process of time by the natural links of contiguity and common work for national needs.

Meanwhile our examination of the Church—that great institution which has caused, in the past, the discrimination against Jews in European nations that has had such disastrous results—has shown that, in essentials, Church doctrine and practice are largely derived from and are identical with those of the Synagogue. In the preceding chapter we have seen that the fundamentals of European civilization are identical for Jew and Gentile; in the present one it has been shown that much of the details of that civilization are likewise identical in the two

spiritual spheres. Even the most violent churchman must recognize the substantial identity of the fundamental ideals of Church and Synagogue. It will be shown in succeeding chapters that much of the superstructure raised on these foundations was also the common work of Jew and Gentile.

CHAPTER III

JEW'S BECOME EUROPEANS

WE have seen how, by adoption of the main Jewish ideals by Christianity, the fundamental principles upon which both Jews and Christians were to guide their lives for nearly two thousand years became practically identical, though with divergencies in details the importance of which both sides tended to exaggerate. We have now to study the Jewish superstructure raised upon these principles on European soil during the Middle Ages, so as to ascertain how far the Jewish element in Europe became vitally incorporated with the rest in the European State system. There is much current misunderstanding on this point both among Jews and others. The mediæval Jews are regarded as an entirely alien element in Europe—of alien race (which is mainly true), of alien tongue (which is not true; they were merely bilingual), entirely outside the State organizations (which

is only partly true), and untouched by the general European stream of culture. This last is so far from being true that they both shared in it and actually contributed to it largely, considering their numbers. It is true that Jews held a special status in mediæval Christendom and Islam, but it is forgotten how many different sections of society had an equally special status. To understand the position of the Jews in Europe, both in the Middle Ages and in contemporary Eastern Europe, one must get a clear idea of this status of the Jews about which the learned seem to be still at sea.

The most usual view, among legal historians like Scherer,¹ or Maitland and Pollock,² is that the Jews were regarded as aliens in the different countries in which they lived; and that this explains their peculiar disabilities, for in the Middle Ages aliens had no rights.³ But against this lies the patent fact that the children of aliens have all the rights of the land of their birth, so that alienage is not a heritable quality, whereas

¹ *Die Verhaeltnisse der Juden in den deutsch-oesterreichischen Laendern*, Leipzig, 1901.

² *History of English Law*, vol. i, p. 451-8.

³ Heffter, *Voelkerrecht*, 8th edition, p. 108; quoting Wilda, *Strafrecht der Germanen*, 672.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Judaism in mediæval times obviously was. It would be absurd, for example, to call Moses of Oxford, who sold the site of Merton College to Walter de Merton, an alien, since we could trace his ancestry in England for at least six generations back. Nor were they without rights, as is contended in an ingenious essay by Mr. Frank I. Schechter,¹ since they had rights especially conferred upon them by charters which we can trace from the time of Henry I onward. I am afraid I must equally withdraw my own explanation of the mediæval Jewish status, which I put forward in my *Jews of Angevin England*, 1893. I there traced the civil disabilities of the mediæval Jew to his enforced position as usurer, whose estate always escheated to the king, whether he was Jew or Gentile. Since the Jew could only be a usurer, as we shall see, his property would be, in this view, constructively the king's, even while he was living. Against this view Pollock and Maitland² rightly urge that there was an essential difference between Jewish and Christian usury, inasmuch as the Jew could

¹ "The Rightlessness of Mediæval English Jewry," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, vol. iv, pp. 121-151.

² *Loc. cit.*, i, 471.

sue for his usurious debts in the king's courts, and the Christian could not.

Nor can one subscribe to Prof. Jenks' view that the special relation of Jew to king or emperor was simply due to the fact that the monarch was the natural protector of all classes of society who could find none other. As administrator of the land regarded as the royal domain, he had jurisdiction over widows, orphans, aliens, Jews, lunatics, and later the printing press.¹ Feudal law was, at any rate in the beginning, the law of the fiefs, and those who did not belong to the fiefs had to have their own law or that of the king. Hence the Canon law for priests, and the Merchant law for merchants;² and hence it would seem the law of the Jewish Exchequer for Jews, though Prof. Jenks does not say so. But here again the existence of charters granted by kings and emperors to Jews is sufficient to show that the special relations between them were not due to the casualties of the common law but to a quasi-contractual compact between them, for which, in many cases, we can find Jews paying due consideration.

¹ Jenks, *loc. cit.*, p. 91.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

The key to the situation lies in the political relations of Church and State from the time of Constantine onward. The Church had from the beginning, as we have seen, gone out of its way to emphasize the differences between the two creeds and to invent differences of practice (Sunday against Sabbath; Easter instead of Passover; Gospel lections instead of Haftarat, etc.). As soon as it approached State recognition, it proceeded further on the way to segregation of Jew and Christian. Thus the Council of Elvira, in 306, forbade Christians to marry Jews or even to eat with them; and the former barrier was emphasized in the Theodosian code, in 339, on penalty of death, it being declared a little later, in 388, that such intermarriage was equivalent to adultery. In the former year, 339, Jews were forbidden to purchase Christian slaves, and conversion from Christianity to Judaism was early forbidden (357) on pain of loss of property. Jews were, a little later, excluded from all public offices and dignities (418), and prevented from building new synagogues (423). Thus there is a distinct and deliberate attempt on the part of the Church, as soon as it got into power, to segregate and degrade Jews.

But the new Christian emperors were emperors as well as Christians, and felt obliged to follow the tradition of Roman law about the Jews, as well as their new ecclesiastical masters. Now, in the law of imperial Rome, Judaism was a "*religio licita*." And hence we find the codes forbidding disturbance of Jewish religious assemblies (393), and permitting the Jews to excommunicate "false brothers" (392), and to regulate their own congregations (398). They were even exempted from being called to the courts or for any public service on sabbaths and festivals (409).

This anomalous position represented the ambiguous attitude of the Christian empire towards them. Jews could not be regarded as heathens, since they held a part of the truth, indeed that part of the truth which "proved" Christianity. Therefore their continued existence was desirable as a proof of the true faith. On the other hand, by their obstinate refusal to accept the full truth, they kept themselves outside the pale and were thus infidels, though not heretics, since they had never accepted Christianity and therefore had not "chosen" their own creed, which had come to them by birth. Now it was the

policy of the Catholic Church to contend that heretics and infidels were "perpetui inimici."¹ The mediæval status of the Jew was thus a compromise between the "religio licita" of the Roman empire and the "perpetui inimici" of the Catholic Church.

But what caused the rulers of the State to adopt this stringent unity of faith among its subjects demanded by the Catholic Church? That is really the puzzle of mediæval history, not alone as regards Jews but with regard to all heretics. How was it to the interest of the ruling classes of the State that all their subjects should profess the same beliefs as to the unseen world? One can understand the Church laying stress upon this, since it gave her the control over men's minds and fates. But why should Theodosius, or Honorius, or Sisebut, or Erwig demand uniformity of belief among their subjects and consequently load their Jews with disabilities? Partly, of course, because they were believing and even at times fanatical church-

¹ In the well-known Calvin's (really Colvill) case, by which it was decided that Scotchmen, born after the Union of 1603, were not aliens to English law (7 Coke's Reports, p. 33*). Coke quotes the maxim "All infidels are, in law, *perpetui inimici*." He also refers to Y.B. 12 H. VIII, f. 4.

men, but also, it is probable, because they had observed the bad results of diversity of creed even in State affairs. The early emperors had doubtless noticed how the conflict of pagans and Christians had weakened the State. The Catholic Visigoth kings, who begin the long line of persecuting monarchs, had observed how the existence of Arian monarchs, with Catholic subjects, had weakened and destroyed the Lombards and presented a perpetual source of weakness in Visigothic Spain. Whatever be the cause, from the seventh century onwards, Jews held the anomalous position of being regarded as perpetual enemies, from the Church point of view, yet holding a permitted religion, from the point of view of the State.

The same attitude was adopted by Islam. Muhammed himself had coquetted with the Jews in the hope that they would adopt him as their Messiah. But, on being repulsed, he made them the first "Dhimmis," or subject yet protected races. Yet Islam was in much the same position toward Judaism as Christianity itself, inasmuch as it recognized its validity so far as it went. When the Arabs spread into neighboring lands possessing inhabitants with diverse creeds,

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

the principle was laid down that the "Ahl al-Kitab," or peoples possessing Scriptures, should be tolerated in Islamic lands, though subject to certain legal and social disqualifications. These applied to Christians and Sabæans, as well as to Jews; but as time went on the last-mentioned became almost the sole examples of "the people of the book." Of course, Jews could not intermarry with true believers, or hold them as slaves, and they had to wear a distinguishing mark or badge known as *Shakalah*, a provision which was afterwards adopted by Innocent III at the Lateran Council of 1215.

Thus both in Church and Mosque the Jews were tolerated persons, though laboring under disabilities, and this gave them a special function to perform as intermediaries between the two faiths in the early Middle Ages. They could travel both in Christian and Muslim lands without interference on account of their creed, while in both spheres they would find brethren in faith with whom they could communicate in Hebrew and who yet spoke the vernacular. By the middle of the ninth century we find an Arabic geographer, Ibn Khordadbeh, in his *Book of Routes*, referring to Jewish merchants,

JEWS BECOME EUROPEANS

called by him Radanites, as bringing goods and slaves from Europe to the Far East and back. When sending an embassy to Harun al-Rashid,¹ Charlemagne sent a Jew named Isaac to accompany the embassy, probably as interpreter. So well understood was this rôle of commercial intermediary by the Jew that in the early German capitularies the regular formula was "Jews and other merchants." We shall see later on how this commercial intermediacy of the Jews influenced the slave, drug, and spice trades, which were the chief things interchanged between East and West in the early Middle Ages up to the Crusades.

The Crusades brought about a new turn in the condition of the European Jews in two ways. Being wars of religion, they aroused the religious passions of Europe to the highest pitch, and brought out popular antipathy to Jews, who were equally enemies of Christ with the Saracens. But, besides this, the need of ready cash for the Crusaders themselves emphasized the position of the Jews in the different countries as indirect tax-gatherers of the king. Their use for this pur-

¹ For details, see chapter vi.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

pose had been seen by those "superb political animals," as Prof. Jenks calls the Normans.¹

William the Conqueror brought over Jews from Rouen to England soon after the Conquest, and we find them equally prominent in the Two Sicilies in the twelfth century. The Church policy towards "usury," as is well known, had thrown into Jewish hands all capitalism, and the Norman kings had the sense to see the use that could be made of the Jewish capitalists, as indirect tax-gatherers, to increase the royal power.

The Jews were thus utilized to break up the Clan-State of feudalism, by the Norman and other kings, when the strict tenure by military service began to be commuted in the form of money payment by scutages and the like. This commutation could only be made in ready cash, of which the Jews were the only persons who could supply them to the chance comer. It is clear, from Magna Charta and elsewhere, that the kings, by this means, got a hold on the baronage. The Jews, not being able to bear

¹ I desire to express my indebtedness to Prof. E. Jenks for the insight given into mediæval conditions by his *Law and Politics in the Middle Ages*.

arms—another survival of their status in the pagan empire—could not hold fiefs, and so had to confine their activities to the towns, where they often acted as intermediaries between the kings and the municipalities in the triangular quarrels among kings, nobles, and townfolk.

Something similar had occurred earlier in the Carolingian empire where the Jews had come under the special protection of the emperors, as indeed did all merchants. In the early Middle Ages it was inconceivable that anybody should be in the country without being somebody's "man." Hence in the Holy Roman empire Jews were regarded as "*servi camerae*," or, in other words, they were only subject to the emperor's chancery in matters of jurisdiction, and that meant ultimately of taxation.

But it is entirely misleading to regard this special and direct relation to the king and the emperor as anything particularly degrading to the mediæval Jew. The barons were equally the king's "men," as indeed their name directly implies. The Jews had, like the barons, the right of free movement through the land, which at once differentiated them from the serfs or "*adscripti glebæ*." This made them practically

free men, so far as any person could be free in the hierarchical systems of feudalism.¹ Even the principle that the property of the Jew ultimately belonged to the king or the emperor was no more than an extension of the principle of "eminent domain," which applied equally to other sections of the nation.² When we read of the many exactions extorted from the Jews, it seems at first sight as if they were exceptionally treated in this regard, but, to take the case of England as an example, one finds in Madox's *History of the Exchequer* exactly the same class and amount of reliefs, aids, amercia-ments, fines, and so on, extorted alike from Jew and Christian.

That the Jew held no such degraded position in the early Middle Ages as is usually represented is shown by the fact that he had his own law to deal with cases in which Jews only were concerned. We find this in Spain and Sicily,

¹ The Jews recognized this themselves at the time. See Tosafot, Baba Kamma, 58a: "The Jews may stay wherever they wish, just like the knights."

² See Maitland's translation of Giercke, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages*, p. 79, and notes 270, 271, on the maxim "Omnia principis esse intelliguntur," and on the doctrine of "dominium soninens."

as well as in England. There was nothing incongruous to mediæval ideas in this. Everyone belonged to a certain group, community or "universitas" (corporation or fellowship) which was collectively responsible for him, and this group gave him his status. Each status had its own set of laws. There were the Law Merchant, the Canon Law, the Laws of the Forest and of the Staple, Crowner's Quest Law, besides the jurisdiction of the Manor and Municipal Courts. Perhaps the most remarkable instance is given by the court attached to the "universitas" or community of foreign students at Paris, Bologna, or Oxford, who had thus, as it were, exterritoriality; there is still a survival of this in the University Courts of to-day at Oxford and Cambridge. There was, therefore, nothing abnormal in the Assize of Jewry or the Jewish Exchequer, except as implying a special status for the mediæval Jew, which was no more degrading or exceptional than that of the merchant, the cleric, the student, or the forester.

But this special status of the Jew was common throughout Western Europe owing, in the first instance, to the common influence of the Church, and in the second to the example of

the Norman chanceries. The most remarkable thing about mediæval Europe is the conformity of attitude shown by the different nations which helped to produce that common feeling which we nowadays call, indifferently, Christianity or civilization. The chief element in this was, of course, the Church; but beside it was that tendency which we know as chivalry, based on feudalism and finding its military representative in the mounted knight. No more striking example of the unity of feeling, produced by these elements, can be given than the spread of the Arthurian and Carolingian romances, from Iceland to Portugal, from England to Sicily.

Now among these unifying elements, which help to give the common ground of civilization for all Europe, west of the Oder, must be included the existence of Jews, with their special yet common status, in all these countries. They may have been small in numbers, but they loomed large in the popular imagination owing to the policy of the Church, expressed in St. Bernard's words: "They are living symbols for us, representing the Lord's Passion. For this are they dispersed to all lands, so that, while they pay the just penalty of so great a crime, they may be

witnesses for our redemption.”¹ In other words, the Church regarded the Jews as ecclesiastical helots. Jews were to be kept alive as living proofs of the Passion, but at the same time they were to be degraded in every possible way in order to show the ill-effects of denying the Passion.

How late this attitude of the Church kept on and how deeply it influenced men's minds may be illustrated by a summary of the argument given by J. J. Beck,² who discusses whether Jews ought to be suffered in a Christian republic and on what conditions. The reasons he gives for tolerating them is because God has done so up to the present, because their dispersion was prophesied, and because toleration is the right of every man, and they are even men like Christians. Besides this, they prove the truth of the Old Testament, and God's providence has preserved them; while much inconvenience may result from expelling them, as is shown by Spain; besides which it is easy to check their wickedness and usury, and one ought to love one's enemies, and

¹ Bouquet, *Recueil*, xv, 606.

² See his elaborate treatise, *Von Recht der Juden*, Nürnberg, 1741.

we can check their blasphemies. But they ought not to injure Christians or disturb them at their devotions; should wear special clothing and not build new synagogues or convert any Christians, or prevent any of their brethren from becoming Christians; they should not receive converts or speak disrespectfully of the religion of Christians or insult their Lord and Savior.

But though there was something really devilish in the Church's deliberate scheme to keep the Jews ever before the eyes of Christendom and yet degrade them by all the disabilities they could induce the secular powers to impose, it would be unjust to regard this attitude as a special instance of the Church's intolerance and persecuting tendency. So far from this being the case, the Church's attitude toward and treatment of the Jews was, in a measure, a remarkable example of toleration. If an ordinary Frenchman, or Spaniard, dared to express doubts as to the Virgin birth, or as to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, he was liable to death by burning or torture; yet, by his side might stand a Jew who resolutely and absolutely denied both dogmas without suffering directly any corporal pains for the heinous

JEWS BECOME EUROPEANS

offence. The existence of these recognized deniers of the fundamentals of the Faith must have kept alive, in the minds of all men, the possibilities of doubt. The very existence of the Jew was, in a measure, an incitement to freedom of thought, though in Church policy he was being preserved in the midst of Christendom for quite the opposite effect.

Yet, while the Jews thus contributed, in their way, toward the growth of that common feeling, which we nowadays know as European civilization, they helped also toward the growth of that feeling of nationalism which ultimately broke up the mediæval community of feeling and caused the Holy Roman empire to become a mere shadow. For, by their direct relations to the kings, they helped toward that consolidation of royal power and centralization of all justice, which was the necessary prelude to the making of the State, in the modern sense of the word. In all the chief towns the Jewries formed an element which enabled the kings and emperors to exercise a leverage on the municipalities, while, by their position as universal heirs to the estate of each Jew, they were enabled to get control of most of the nobles. This activity of the Jews,

in helping to crystallize the different nations around their kings, began with the Crusades, which tended to reduce all men toward the same taxable level. But it did not last very long, owing to the expensive character of this method of taxation which led, sooner or later, to expulsion of the Jews, their place in this regard being taken by Italian merchants. By the time of the Black Death (1349), this function of the Jew, in helping to create the separate nationalities of Europe, by contributing to the king's power, had almost died away.

The Jews could not have had these effects, either in unifying Christendom or nationalizing the West European nations, if they had been entirely outside the national life, as is usually represented. So far from this being the case, they were, after the Crusades, throughout Europe a distinct organ of the State. Their usury was used by the kings as part of the national exchequer in England, France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, and thus the king became a "sleeping" partner in all their transactions; so it is not too much to say that, in every case, he was the arch-usurer of his kingdom.

That otherwise the Jews formed part of the

national life is shown by their complete adoption of the vernacular wherever they dwelt.¹ By a curious coincidence some of the earliest examples of French exist in the French glosses transliterated into Hebrew, to be found in the commentaries of Rashi (died 1104) and his school, the Tosafists. If the English Jews also spoke French, that was because they really belonged to the upper classes of England, who did the same up to the middle of the fourteenth century. Perhaps the most touching examples of this full adoption of the national languages is shown by the history of Yiddish. When the German Jews were expelled from the south German towns in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, they carried with them into Poland the dialect used in the south German districts, and retain this language up to the present day. So, too, when the Spanish Jews had to leave Spain, they carried with them their Spanish language, which is used by them in the Levant

¹ Even in clothing there was no distinction in the early Middle Ages, or otherwise there would have been no necessity for the badge. In later times only Jews became conspicuous by their dress, owing to the fact that they clung to the fashions of earlier days.

under the title of Ladino up to the present day.¹ Similarly the Russian Jews, when settling in America, preserved their identity as inhabitants of different Russian towns like Grodno, Wilna, and the like. It is true that, in addition to these tongues, many or even most Jews read and, possibly in some cases, speak Hebrew, owing to the excellent system of education which the needs of their religion caused them to adopt. But, from a linguistic point of view, they formed part of the nations among whom they dwelt, as thoroughly and consistently as at the present day. The separation in language and deliberate segregation in Jewish quarters only came after the Black Death, with the innumerable expulsions which brought German-speaking Jews into Poland, Spanish-speaking Jews into Turkey, and French-speaking Jews into Germany or Italy.

How completely Europeanized Jews had become by the end of the first Christian millennium was strikingly shown by the *Takkanah* of Rabbi Gershom of Mayence (about 1000 A.D.), by which Jews agreed to adopt monogamy while

¹ They even retained the different Spanish dialects, as was shown by their keeping separate the congregations of Catalonia, of Aragon, and of Castile, even at Constantinople, or Salonica.

JEW'S BECOME EUROPEANS

dwelling in Christian lands. Owing to the Jewish principle that the Law is perfect and perpetual, it could not be granted that the patriarchs had done anything illegal in marrying more wives than one; but the rabbis wisely recognized that they would be outraging the feelings of their neighbors if they continued this Oriental practice in Europe, and voluntarily agreed, by the above-mentioned enactment, to confine themselves to one wife while living surrounded by Christians.¹ In so doing they were only following a general principle which has been summed up in the Jewish legal maxim, "Dina de-Malkuta Dina" (the law of the land is the law of the Jew), which prevented any wide divergence between Jewish and European law, even when administered by Jews, except with regard to their religious requirements. Dr. A. A. Neuman gives an interesting instance of this from the Responsa of Ibn Adret, in which that authority declares that the king of Aragon could legally, according to Jewish

¹ Occasionally Jews got permission from the kings to marry more than one wife (presumably when the first wife was sterile). (See Jacobs's *Spanish-Jewish History*, Nos. 3, 148, 946, 1226, 1227.) It will be remembered that Luther gave permission for the duke of Hesse to have two wives, for the same reason. For the Papalist position, see A. L. Smith, *Church and State*, 72.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

law, do something which a Jewish king in the Holy Land would not be allowed to do under the same jurisdiction.¹

Thus, in the last resort, the Jews of the Middle Ages were, in a measure, true nationals of the different states where they had their dwelling-place, even though they had a special status and autonomy in matters concerning themselves. But this did not make them so conspicuous in the mediæval State, since almost all men who had similar occupations possessed their own distinguishing status, and in most cases had their own law courts to decide disputes among themselves. The differentia was given by the Church policy, which deliberately aimed at degrading the Jewish status by special marks on clothing and by interdictions of all kinds against community of interest and community of intercourse between Jew and Christian.

Yet, notwithstanding this, Jew and Christian did share in the common life to a large extent, even in sport, and certainly in commerce and, above all, in the world of intellect. As we have seen, Jews adopted the language and even the

¹ *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, No. 22, p. 65.

JEWES BECOME EUROPEANS

dress of the nations among whom they dwelt, until they were expelled or obliged to wear the badge. They constituted a common element in Western Europe, which helped to give that sense of community which is so striking a characteristic of mediæval times and is the foundation of the common feeling of European civilization in the present day. Yet, by their peculiar relation to the kings and emperors, they also contributed to that growth of nationalism which broke up the consensus of the Holy Roman empire and made modern Europe. But besides these effects on European culture, the existence of a separate class of Jews, with a special status in most of the countries of Christendom and in all those of Islam during the early Middle Ages, enabled them to act as intermediaries between East and West, between Christendom and Islam, both in the intellectual and in the material spheres, as will be shown in the following chapters.

CHAPTER IV

MEDIÆVAL JEWS AS INTELLECTUAL INTER-MEDIARIES

WE have seen that, owing to the peculiar status, religious and legal, of Jews in the Holy Roman empire and in Islam, they held a privileged position in both spheres. In consequence of this they formed suitable intermediaries between Christian and Muslim lands where they were both permitted to travel and could find kinsmen or coreligionists wherever they did so. As a consequence we soon find them monopolizing international trade between East and West under the name of Radanites, as described by Ibn Khordadbeh at the beginning of the ninth century.¹ They carried goods not only but also ideas from East to West, for in the ninth and tenth centuries the Orient was practically the sole factory of thought. The early Caliphs, as soon as they had consolidated their conquests,

¹ See chapter vi.

sought to make accessible to their subjects the wisdom of the ancient world, so far as still extant in Syriac translations from the Greek, concentrating at first their attention upon Greek astronomy and medicine, but also making accessible the chief works of Aristotle as a guide to systematizing their own thought. The Jews who lived in Muslim countries soon adopted from their Arab *confrères* this Greek science and thought, and were later able, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, to help transfer it to the newly created schools and universities of Europe, which thus owes to them a catalysing influence, at a critical moment, in the development of European thought and culture.

It is difficult to appraise this intellectual influence of Jews on mediæval Europe at its true value. The subject is still obscure; it has not yet been worked out in all its details by modern scholars. There is still no adequate account of Arabic astronomy and medicine, or even philosophy, and this is not extraordinary, considering there is a whole world of Arabic manuscripts still to be explored. The mediæval science of Europe only attracts slight attention, owing to its completely obsolete and useless character.

Only on the Jewish side have we anything like an adequate account of their translating activities and of their original contributions to astronomy and mathematics. The great polyhistor, Moritz Steinschneider, devoted seventy years of his laborious life to the study of just this aspect of Jewish culture, its intermediation in mediæval science, and was fortunately able to complete his investigations in two of its chief aspects.¹ Unfortunately, Steinschneider disdained putting his results in any shape suitable for popular comprehension or cultural appreciation; and I have had great difficulty in getting at the real value of Jewish contributions from his drier-than-dust annals. Where the forest is difficult to view on account of the trees, one can only attempt to locate the forest in its connection with the larger world.

Even when one has determined the exact contributions made by Jews to mediæval science and

¹ *Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1893. *Die Mathematik bei den Juden*, Berlin, 1905. Unfortunately, he never summed up his researches on Jewish medicine, and only wrote a popular lecture on Jewish contributions to folk-literature (*Zur Volksliteratur der Juden*, in *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, ii, Leipzig, 1871, pp. 1-21), though the latter sections of his *Uebersetzungen* deal sufficiently with this last subject.

thought, either in translated or in original form, the results may seem unimportant, owing to the small intrinsic value of Arabic and mediæval science in general. Due to their addiction to book learning, as opposed to experiment and experience, the mediævals added little that was positive; it is probable that a single year nowadays adds more to our knowledge of nature and of man than the whole period between 800 and 1500, which we may class as mediæval.¹ But slight as may have been the intrinsic value of mediæval contributions to science and thought, the habit of thinking was kept alive by them, and this was no slight contribution. But for the Jews and the scholastics, Europe might have fallen into a deadly monotony of orthodox conservatism akin to that of China.

In attempting to appraise the Jewish share in this catalysis of European thought, we have to distinguish between their activities, on the one hand, as translators or intermediaries between Arabic science and Europe and, on the

¹ The sole exception seems to be in political science, where the actual needs of the day led to experiment and induction. See Maitland, Giercke, and Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, Cambridge, 1907. Here the Jews contributed nothing till Bodin.

other, their direct and original contributions which we cannot, of course, expect to be of intrinsically greater value than those of other mediævals. It is in their intermediation as translators between Islam and Christendom that we have to find the chief valuable function of Jewish intellectual activity in the Middle Ages. And here we have to distinguish, among the various Jewish translations enumerated by Steinschneider, between what I would call "terminals" and "junctions." When a Jew translated from the Arabic (or sometimes from the Latin) into Hebrew, and no translation was made into any European tongue, this corresponds to a railway terminal, from which the train proceeds no further. But if the translating process is continued further into Latin, we may regard this instance as equivalent to a railway junction through which many trains pass. It is obvious that, for the present purpose, we need only confine our attention to these translating "junctions," since it is only in that case that Jewish activity was of an intermediary kind. We shall see further on that even what I have called "terminal translations" have significance from the general standpoint of this book.

It is not perhaps so difficult to sum up, in broad outline, what mediæval Europe owed intellectually to the Arabs. There is, first and foremost, the Indian numerals with the use of the zero and the decimal system, which we still call "Arabic figures"; with this came Indian geometry. Then most of the astronomical tables used by astronomers, ship-masters, and map-makers in mediæval times were derived from the Arabs. As we can tell from their names, many drugs and condiments came from the Saracens, and some of mediæval medical practice can be traced back to them. Even at the present day a certain number of folk-tales, derived from India and still current among the folk, can be traced directly through Arabia. Along with these we may reckon the game of chess, which, though Indian in origin and Persian by name, came into Europe with the Moors. Besides these, mediæval acquaintance with certain of the Greek writers, notably Aristotle in philosophy and Galen in medicine, was acquired in Arabic forms, while the cycle of thought, known as Averroism, had a remarkable, if restricted, influence on the progress of free thought in Europe. Jews were, as we shall see, intimately

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

connected with every one of these movements or contributions, and in every case it may be doubted if they would have spread to Europe without the intermediation of Jews by means, in most cases, of translation.

The chief centers of this translating activity of the Jews were Toledo and Naples, both outposts of Christian Europe on the borders of Muslim Spain and Sicily. The fanaticism of the Almohades had driven Jews of Muslim lands, like Abraham ibn Ezra, the Ibn Tibbon family, across into Christian countries where they brought to their coreligionists a knowledge of Arabic science which they translated into Hebrew. The need of translating into that language the works of the great Jewish thinkers like Saadya, Bahya, Judah ha-Levi, and Maimonides also led to much translating activity from Arabic into Hebrew. As an outcome of this, great Christian patrons of learning, who were anxious to acquire the wisdom of the Arabs, then the most powerful as well as the most cultured people on earth, made use of Jewish translators from the Arabic to help in the transmission. Among these patrons may be specially mentioned the archbishop Raymond of Toledo in the twelfth century, Charles of

Anjou and the emperor Frederick II in the thirteenth century, Alfonso X in the same century, and Robert of Anjou and Pedro III of Aragon in the fourteenth century. In many cases the translations thus ordered appeared under the names of Christian translators, who made use of the Jews merely as "understudies" or dragomen who probably read out the translation from the Arabic (or Hebrew) into the vernacular, Spanish or Italian, which the Christian translator then turned into Latin. Roger Bacon, in his *Compendium Studii*,¹ describes the process in the following terms: "But far greater errors happen in translating philosophy. Wherefore, when a many translations on all kinds of knowledge have been given us by Gerard of Cremona, Michael the Scot, Alfred the Englishman, Hermann the German, and William the Fleming, you cannot imagine how many blunders occur in their works. (Besides, they did not even know Arabic.) In the same way Michael Scot claimed the merit of numerous translations. But it is certain that Andrew a Jew laboured at them more than he did . . . and so with the rest."

We have several instances of such collabora-

¹ Ed. Brewer, p. 471.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

tion in addition to those hinted at by Roger Bacon. Jacob ben Makir helped Johannes de Brixia to translate Al-Zarkali into Latin, 1263. A certain Abraham assisted Ralph of Bruges with the translation of a work on the Astrolabe, Jacob Anatoli helped Michael Scot with his translation of al-Farghani, and a certain Magister Maynus, afterward baptized under the name of John, helped John de Planis to translate Averroes. A Jew named Jacob helped in Paravitiu's translation of one of Avenzoar's medical works. When Plato of Tivoli dedicates one of his works to the convert John of Seville, we can have little doubt that he was indebted to him for help in some of his translations, as we know he was similarly indebted to Abraham bar Hiyya (known to the Christian world as Savasorda). But quite apart from this indirect help in the process of transmission from Orient to Occident, we have direct evidence of Jewish participation in all the lines of research mentioned above as due to the Arabs, and to that we may now return.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of the adoption by Europe of the Indian arithmetic with its decimal system and use of zero. Without this modern mathematics would have

JEWS AS INTELLECTUAL INTERMEDIARIES

been impossible, and on mathematics the whole superstructure of modern civilization is erected.¹

Now the latest inquirers on the introduction of Arabic figures (that is, Indian numerals) into Europe come to the conclusion that the Jewish Radanites, to whom we shall have to refer again, "must necessarily have spread abroad a knowledge of all number systems used in recording prices or in the computations of the market."² Their views are unexpectedly confirmed by a passage in Abraham ibn Ezra, who, in speaking of the transmission of the Indian stories known as *Kalilah wa-Dimnah*, to which we shall refer later, mentions the Jew whom the Caliph Es-Saffah (750-5) employed to translate the book, who was sent by him to India and brought back a Hindu named Kanka, who introduced the Indian numerals. It is worth while quoting Abraham ibn Ezra's exact words: "In olden times there was neither science nor religion among

¹ See an interesting development of this thesis in *Cornhill Magazine*, 1905. It is obvious at once that engineering, quantitative chemistry, and statistics depend directly upon mathematical progress.

² *Hindu-Arabic Numerals*, by Prof. D. E. Smith and Dr. L. C. Karpinski (Ginn & Co.), p. 101. See my review, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, vol v, p. 123.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

the sons of Ishmael . . . till the great king, by name Es-Saffah (750-5), arose, who heard that there were many sciences to be found in India. . . . And there came men saying that there was in India a very mighty book on the secrets of government, in the form of a fable. . . . And the name of the book was Kalilah and Dimnah. . . . Thereupon he sent for a Jew who knew both languages, and ordered him to translate this book. . . . And when he saw that the contents of the book were extraordinary—as indeed they are—he desired to know the science of the Indians, and he accordingly sent the Jew to Arin, whence he brought back one who knew the Indian numerals, and besides many astronomical writings(?).”¹

Not alone was a Jew thus the means of bringing the Indian numerals from India to Arabic lands, but there can be no doubt that it was through a Jew that the Indian arithmetic was introduced to European students of mathematics. For it was John of Seville, known also as Aven Deuth (that is, Ibn Daud), who translated

¹ Steinschneider in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 24, pp. 353-354. See also Jacobs, *Fables of Bidpai*, pp. xviii-xix.

JEWS AS INTELLECTUAL INTERMEDIARIES

Muhammed al-Khwarizmi's work on Practical Indian Arithmetic into Latin, which first brought this method to the notice of European students. The method was named after the author's name, "Algorism," which, in the last resort, means "the method of Khiva."¹ In a similar way Indian geometry was introduced at the same time by Plato of Tivoli, John of Seville's friend, who translated into Latin from the Hebrew Abraham bar Hiyya's work on the subject, which he entitled "Liber Embadorum." Later on both books, John's "Algorism" and Plato's "Liber Embadorum," were used by Leonardo di Pisa as the foundation for his text-books on Indian arithmetic, geometry, and trigonometry, on which the whole study of these subjects was based in the Middle Ages. There could be no doubt of the intermediation of the Jews in introducing this vital change in the foundations of European mathematics.

In astronomy, the chief form of applied mathematics, Jews were equally prominent in transferring the Arabic knowledge of the stars and Greco-Arabic astronomy generally from

¹ Cantor, *Gesch. d. Math.* (Leipsig, 1880), i, 612, and other references given by Steinschneider, *Heb. Uebers.*, p. 982, Note 64.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Islam to Christendom. It is true that the translation into Latin of the *Almagest* of Ptolemy was made in 1117 by Gerard of Cremona without, so far as known, any assistance from a Jew.¹ But all the more important astronomical tables of the Middle Ages were either translated or compiled by the help of Jews, and it was of course these tables which were the foundation of all practical applications of astronomy in observatory work, map-making, and, above all, navigation. In large part these tables were original contributions, inasmuch as they implied adaptation of the astronomical formulæ to the particular epoch for which they were written. Strictly speaking, therefore, their enumeration would come under the next section of our inquiry dealing with original work. But, as much of the work involved was also merely translation and adaptation, we may perhaps sum up their history in this place.

In the year 1070 a number of Jewish astronomers helped in the compilation of the *Toledo*

¹ He also translated Euclid; so that Greek mathematics, both pure (Euclid) and applied (Ptolemy), was introduced into Europe without Jewish aid, a striking exception to the general rule. Roger Bacon, however, implies that Gerard, like Michael Scot, had a Jewish interpreter by his side. See *supra*, p. 145.

Tables, edited by Ibrahim al-Zarkali just before Toledo fell into the hands of the Cid.¹ When Alfonso X of Castile desired to utilize these tables and adapt them to the epoch of his time, he obtained the services of Isaac ibn Sid (Don Zag) and other Jewish astronomers, who compiled the Alfonsine Tables and translated them into Spanish. These, again, were re-adapted by Isaac Israeli, also in Toledo, in 1310, and his tables were later utilized by Scaliger and Petavius. Again, in Toledo, Joseph ibn Wakkar made new tables in 1396, and a little before that time Pedro III (IV) of Aragon had new tables made for him by Jews. Emanuel ben Jacob, known as Bonfils de Tarascon, compiled valuable tables based upon those of al-Battani. These were later quoted by Favaro, Pico de la Mirandola, and Peiresc, having been translated into Latin in 1406 by John Luca, M.D. The most important of these Jewish tables, however, were those composed by Abraham Zacuto, teacher of astronomy at Salamanca, and astronomer royal to King Emanuel of Portugal in 1492. These tables were translated into Latin and Spanish by his pupil, Joseph Vechino, and were used by Columbus in

¹ M. Steinschneider, *Études sur Zarkali*, Rome, 1888.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

his epoch-making voyage to the New World. His copy still exists, with his autograph notes, at the Columbina at Seville.¹ It may be added that all these tables may be traced back to the Indian ones referred to by Abraham ibn Ezra in the passage given above, in which a Jew was also intermediary and which were adapted by a Jewish astronomer.

The works of al-Battani and al-Farghani, the two chief Arabic writers on astronomy, were translated into Latin from the Arabic by Johannes Hispalensis about 1140. Al-Kindi's treatise on the Moon Stations was translated for Robert of Anjou, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, by Kalonymos ben Kalonymos, known to his Christian friends as Maestro Calo. Al-Heitham's general work on astronomy was translated at the request of Alfonso X by a Jew named Abraham into Spanish and thence, probably by a Christian, into Latin. A later Hebrew translation, by Jacob ben Makir, was translated much later by Abraham de Balmes for Cardinal Grimani, in the middle of the sixteenth century. It must be remembered that Jews had a special interest

¹ M. Kayserling, *Christopher Columbus and the Discovery of America*, pp. 47-8, note.

in astronomical calculations owing to the divergence of their calendar, both from the Christian and the Muhommedan one. It must be remembered, too, that they took an equal interest with those of the daughter religions in the promises of astrology.

Turning to medicine, the other chief science in which the Arabs helped to transmit the wisdom of the Greeks into Europe, one cannot trace any intermediation of Jews in this regard, the works of Galen and Hippocrates being translated from the Arabic by Constantinus Afer and Gerard of Cremona. Curiously enough, the first of these translators rendered accessible to Europe the chief Jewish physician, Isaac Judæus, who wrote in Arabic. There is a Spanish translation, probably by a Jew, in the Escorial, which also contains another of the works of Maimonides on Hæmorrhoids. Maimonides's well-known letter on Diet, written for the son of Saladdin, was translated into Latin by the convert John of Capua. But in adapting the works of the Arabic medical writers into Latin the Jews were exceptionally active. The chief translations in which Jews helped were the *Continens* of Rhazes, translated by Moses Faradj at the re-

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

quest of Charles of Anjou in 1280, and the *Colliget* of Averroes, translated by the Jew Bonacosa at Padua, 1255. Jews also helped in the translation of the *Book of Simples*, by Albucasis, and the *Rules of Health*, by Avenzoar (Ibn Zuhr), 1281. Jewish activity in mediæval medicine was seemingly more practical and original than intermediary, as we shall see further on.

One of the most remarkable instances of Jewish intermediation is afforded by the strange story of the transmission of a number of Indian tales from east to west, known under the various titles of "Fables of Bidpai" (or Pilpay), "Kalilah wa-Dimnah," "Directorium humanæ vitæ," and so on. I have myself edited the English version of this, under the title "The Moral Philosophy of Doni," which I have described as "The English version of an Italian adaptation of a Spanish translation of a Latin version of a Hebrew translation of an Arabic adaptation of the Pehlevi version of the Indian original." This has had an extraordinary vogue. From the pedigree attached to my edition, I calculate that the tales have been translated into thirty-eight languages, in one hundred and twelve different versions which

have passed into about one hundred and eighty editions. Some of the tales contained in it had extraordinary popularity, and it has even been calculated that one-tenth of the common fairy-tale store of Europe has been derived from this source. Two of the links in the above-mentioned chain are certainly due to Jews, the Hebrew translation of Rabbi Joel and the Latin translation of John of Capua, while, if Abraham ibn Ezra's statement, quoted above, is founded on fact, the first stage of the travels of these stories from India was also accompanied by a Jew. According to al-Mas'udi, the game of Chess was also introduced at the same time as the tales, with which the date given by their latest historian agrees.¹ There are similar tales known by the name of "The Book of Sindibad" and "Barlaam and Josaphat." But though both appeared in Hebrew, these only formed a side-switch in the train of transmission, and they cannot be counted to the credit of Jewish intermediation. Perhaps one may refer here to a similar set of stories, written in Latin by the convert Petrus Alfonsi about 1115, entitled "Disciplina

¹ H. J. R. Murray, *The History of Chess*, Oxford, 1913, pp. 26-7, 209-10.

clericalis," most of which have been adapted in French, as Fableaux, and utilized in the novel literature of Boccaccio and his followers. But these books are of extreme interest as showing a common field for Jewish and Christian appreciation of the tale-telling instincts of man.

As regards Aristotle and his great commentator, Averroes, we must distinguish. It is usually stated that Aristotle came to mediæval Europe mainly through Latin translations of Arabic commentaries on Aristotle, and secondly that these Arabic comments were translated into Hebrew and from thence into Latin by Jews. Both statements are true and are proved to the hilt in Renan's earliest, most brilliant, and perhaps most original piece of work, his *Averroes et l'Averroïsme*. But the Latin translations made by Jews from the Hebrew are separated by three hundred years from those made directly from the Arabic, which were the only ones that could have had direct influence on scholasticism. The earliest translations of Averroes were made by Michael Scot at the beginning of the thirteenth century, before most of the Hebrew versions had been made. It is possible that Roger Bacon's assertion that he was assisted by a Jew named Andrew ap-

plies to these translations, but in that case his assistance must have been with regard to the Arabic text. The Jewish translations from the Hebrew into Latin were those of Elia del Medigo for Pico de la Mirandola about 1480, and those of Jacob Mantino and Abraham de Balmes before 1520.¹ The School of Padua, on which Renan lays so much stress, had its chief activity in the sixteenth century, and its influence, which Renan probably overrates, was part of the general Renaissance movement in favor of free thought. Averroism as represented by the Hebrew versions are, as regards the Middle Ages, "terminal," and have to be considered later with relation to other internal movements of Jewish intellectual life during that period.

This may serve as a transition to the second branch of our subject, the direct contributions of Jews to mediæval civilization, and first with regard to medicine. The mere existence of fifty Jewish medical authors in Arabic, enumerated by Ibn Usaibi'a,² does not prove anything more

¹ The sole exception to this statement seems to be the translation of the Middle Commentary on the Meteorology made after the Hebrew version of Kalonymos ben Kalonymos, 1316. Steinschneider, *Hebräische Uebersetzungen*, p. 139.

² The list is given, after Leclerc, by Isidore Loeb, in *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, vol. vii, pp. 101-110.

than direct influence on Arabic medicine, and thus indirect on European. The chief Arabic Jewish writers who seem to have had direct influence on mediæval European medicine were Isaac Israeli on Fever, and Moses Maimonides on Diet, both of which works were early translated into Latin and were often quoted as authoritative. As is well known, the chief centers of medical practice and science in the early Middle Ages were at Salerno and Montpellier, and it is usually asserted that Jews helped both in the founding and development of these schools.¹ Very little evidence, however, can be adduced with regard to Salerno. Among the early professors of the ninth century were two named Joseph and Josan, but they are not definitely stated to be Jews. A favorite manual on anatomy at Salerno was that of one Copho, stated to be a Jew, but as the title of his treatise is *Anatomia Porci*, the attribution seems very doubtful. Nor is the evidence with regard to Montpellier of a much more definite character, though we know that Abraham

¹ F. H. Garrison, *History of Medicine*, p. 90, claims Avenzoar as a Jew, which would add greatly to the importance of Arabic Jewish medicine. Steinschneider, however, denies him to be a Jew (*Hebräische Uebersetzungen*, p. 748).

Abigdor studied medicine at Montpellier in the latter half of the fourteenth century.

Turning to astronomy, we have somewhat more definite information about original contributions of Jews, chiefly owing to recent discoveries about Levi ben Gerson, the inventor of the Jacob's Staff, described by him in his philosophical work *Wars of the Lord*, finished about 1340, of which no less than one hundred and thirty-six chapters are devoted to astronomy. These were immediately translated into Latin by orders of Pope Clement VI in 1342, but when the original Hebrew was published in 1560 that section was omitted. This Jacob's Staff, so named after Genesis 30, 37, served the purpose of a quadrant to determine the Right Ascension of sun and stars, introduced by Regiomontanus after reading the Latin translation of Gersonides.¹ It was also used by Martin Behain, by Columbus, Vasco da Gama, and Magellan, and its general use among mariners was not given up till Hadley introduced his quadrant in 1731. Another quadrant, introduced by a Jew, was that of Jacob ben Makir, after whom it was called "Quadrans Judaicus," which was an improvement on the old quadrant

¹ See A. Schueck, *Der Jakobsstab*, Munich, 1896.

of Robert the Englishman. We have already referred to the large number of astronomical tables executed by the Jews in the Middle Ages and culminating in the *Almanach Perpetuus* of Abraham Zacuto, used by Columbus in his epoch-making voyages.

Levi ben Gerson died in 1344; he is also distinguished in the history of science as the discoverer of the "Camera Obscura," which he described fully.¹ Hitherto the earliest mention of this ingenious instrument is given in the Vitruvius of 1521, though Leonardo da Vinci, who died two years before, had known of it.² Bonet de Latis, physician to the Borgia Pope Alexander VI, invented certain astronomical rings for ascertaining planetary orbits. Thus the contributions of Jews to mediæval astronomy were of appreciable importance, and the art of navigation owes them much.

So, too, in the cognate art of map-making, there are two Jewish names, Mecia and Cresques, the latter of considerable importance. At Mallorca in the Balearic Islands, there lived one

¹ See J. Carlebach, *Levi ben Gerson als Mathematiker*, Berlin, 1910.

² M. Curtze in *Himmel und Erde*, 1901, pp. 225-6.

Jaffuda Cresques known as "Cresques lo Juheu," who is usually credited with that monument of cartography known as the Catalan Map, sent as a present from the monarch of Aragon to his brother of France, 1381, and still extant in the Bibliotheque Nationale. This marks an epoch in European map-making, inasmuch as it added the discoveries of Marco Polo to the conventional map-drawing. When Prince Henry started his nautical observatory at Sagres, and thus began the modern epoch of geographical discovery, he summoned Cresques to take the leadership in 1423. It has been suggested that Cresques must have known Levi ben Gerson's work and introduced the use of the Jacob's Staff, but this is more than doubtful. He certainly did not add any information from Jewish travellers like Benjamin of Tudela and the others,¹ who indeed had no influence on geographical science, and are to be included among the "terminals" (see *infra*, p. 181).

Jews contributed not alone to the established sciences of medicine, astronomy, and geography, but also to the pseudo-sciences which had an equal

¹ Enumerated by Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin, 1875, pp. 146, *seq.*

vogue in the Middle Ages. They were as earnest believers in astrology (with the exception of Maimonides) as their Christian contemporaries, though it is difficult to point out any particular astrological work which they either transmitted to Europe or impressed upon it by original contributions. One of the earliest Arabic astrologers, however, was the Jew Mashallah.¹ So, too, in alchemy there are traces in Hebrew manuscripts of participation of Jews in this foster-father of modern chemistry. Vincent of Beauvais quotes as his chief master in alchemy the Jew Jacob Aranicus.² One of the instruments still used among chemical apparatus is known as the "bain marie," and is stated to have originated with one Maria Judæa; but it is extremely doubtful whether such a lady ever existed, the probability being that one of the early treatises on alchemy was attributed to Miriam, the sister of Moses,³ just as other treatises were attributed to Solomon and other biblical heroes. How far mediæval magic, white and black, was connected with the

¹ Steinschneider, *Arabische Literatur der Juden*, pp. 15-23.

² Spec. nat., vii, 107; Spec. doct., xi, 107.

³ *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 58, pp. 300-309.

Jews is again difficult to ascertain or appraise. The influence of the Kabbalah can certainly be traced in the amulets and abracadabras of the mediæval magicians, but from the nature of the case the whole affiliation is difficult to trace, nor would much credit come to Jews by their participation in these blind strivings to control the unknown.

CHAPTER V

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE main influence, however, of mediæval Jews on the civilization of Christendom was by means of their chief thinkers, Ibn Gabirol and Maimonides. Their philosophical works were translated into Latin, that of the former by Dominic Gundisalvi¹ at Toledo, with the aid of the convert Johannes Hispalensis, about 1160, under the title *Fons Vitæ*, and the latter, under the title *Dux Neutrorum*, by an anonymous translator, who used the Hebrew translation of Judah al-Harizi instead of that of Moses ibn Tibbon. Both thinkers are quoted by name and with respect by all the chief scholastics of the thirteenth, the greatest of the centuries: William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris (1228-49); Alexander

¹ Called Domingo Gonzalez in the Spanish translation of the *Fons Vitæ*.

of Hales (died 1245); Albertus Magnus, count of Bollstädt (1193-1280); and Thomas Aquinas (1225-70). The last three wrote encyclopedias of theology, each entitled *Summa*, culminating in the *Summa Theologiæ* of Aquinas, which has ruled Catholic theology down to the present day, having been declared authoritative by the penultimate Pope Leo XIII. In so far as these Jewish thinkers had an influence on Aquinas, either in the form of adoption or opposition, they have thus helped to shape the thought of Catholic Europe and, indirectly, of Protestantism even down to the present day.¹

The reason why these Jewish thinkers, especially Maimonides, had so great an effect upon their Christian colleagues in the thirteenth century was because the relations between faith and reason had passed approximately through the same phases in Judaism and Christianity, and had

¹ In what follows I am much indebted to the two chief scholars who have studied the relations of Jewish philosophy to scholasticism: M. Joel, *Beitraege zur Geschichte der Philosophie*, Breslau, 1878; and J. Guttmann, *Die Scholastik des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zum Judenthum und zur jüdischen Literatur*, Breslau, 1902; and *Das Verhältniss des Thomas von Aquina zum Judenthum und zur jüdischen Literatur*, Göttingen, 1891.

reached an eirenicon by Maimonides early enough to afford the same solution to the great scholastics. The earliest representatives of Jewish philosophy, Saadya, Bahya, Abraham bar Hiyya, Solomon ibn Gabirol, and Joseph ibn Zaddik, were mainly influenced by the Neo-Platonism of the Kalam, current among the Arabic thinkers. But, with Abraham ibn Daud (1110-1180), the Aristotelianism, which had been made predominant in Arabic thought by Avicenna and Averroes, became predominant also in Jewish thought and brought into prominence the fundamental contradictions between a philosophy founded, like that of Aristotle, on pure reason and a faith based upon a written scripture.¹ The chief points of contradiction were three: How can the God of philosophy—the divine Substance of the universe—possess such attributes as are implied in the Bible; how can He create a world in time as implied in the first chapters of Genesis; and how can His Providence apply to the individual acts of man and

¹ Judah ha-Levi, who, in his *al-Khazari* (1140), recognized this contradiction, is outside the general development of Jewish thought, taking a position corresponding to that in Arabic philosophy of al-Ghazali, by whom indeed he was strongly influenced. Both thinkers are opposed altogether to the application of philosophy to theology.

things? In addition to these fundamental problems there was the further subsidiary inquiry as to how certain individuals, known as prophets, could acquire knowledge as to the true answers to these questions. Moses ben Maimon (Maimonides, born at Cordova, 1135, died at Cairo, 1204) may be fairly said to have solved these problems (from the mediæval standpoint) in his Arabic work entitled *Dalalat al-Hairin* ("Guide of the Perplexed"), composed 1190, and soon after translated into Hebrew by Moses ibn Tibbon and also by Judah al-Harizi, under the title *Moreh Nebukim*; the latter version was, as we have seen, translated into Latin and made accessible to the chief scholastics of the thirteenth century, who utilized it to solve exactly the same problems which had arisen in Christian thought as in Judaism, and for the same reason—the adoption of Aristotelianism.

With the earlier scholastics (like Anselm, Bernard, and John of Salisbury), or even with Abaelard, these difficulties had not occurred because, in the main, the basis of their thought, so far as it was philosophical, was Platonic, or at least Neo-Platonic. They had based themselves mostly upon St. Augustine, who was imbued

with Platonism, while many of the treatises which had come to them from the Arabs with the name of Aristotle, like the *Secretum Secretorum*, or the *Liber de Causis*, were really Neo-Platonic works. Now Christianity had already been largely influenced by Neo-Platonic thought from the very beginning in the Gospel of John, and was not, therefore, fundamentally disturbed by further infusion of it.

But when Archbishop Raymond of Toledo, in the middle of the twelfth century, caused the physical and metaphysical works of Aristotle to be made accessible in Latin translations, executed, as we have seen, by Dominic Gundisalvi (possibly assisted by his Jewish associate, Johannes Hispalensis) and by Gerard of Cremona, the same problems necessarily arose which had engaged the attention of Maimonides.¹ It can therefore be easily understood how eagerly his aid was invoked by the great scholastics of the thirteenth century, who were puzzled by the same problems and had reached the same crisis in their line of thought.

¹ The logical and rhetorical works had already been made accessible in Latin by Bæthius, and formed the basis of the Quadrivium. See H. O. Taylor, *The Mediæval Mind*, chapter 34, Methods of Scholasticism.

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

But before dealing in such detail as our space permits with the manner in which the Christian scholastics adopted the solution of the Jewish theologian, a discussion would be in order of the contrasting influence of Solomon ibn Gabirol upon the same thinkers, which forms one of the most curious episodes in the history of thought. He is quoted by all of the four greater scholastics of the thirteenth century mentioned above under the name of Avicebron, Avicebrom, or Avicebrol. None of them, however, knew that he was a Jew; indeed, William of Auvergne argues rather elaborately that, though an Arab, he must have been a Christian, because his views about the Will of God correspond so closely to the Christian doctrine of the Word or Logos.¹ When Jourdain published his researches upon the Latin translations of Aristotle, he came across these and similar references to Avicebron's work, *Fons Vitæ*, and declared that the scholasticism of the thirteenth century could not be properly understood without taking into account the influence of this work.² Almost immediately afterward Salomon

¹ *De Universo* I, xxv, quoted by Guttmann, *Scholastik*, p. 26, Note 2.

² *Recherches*, second edition, 1843, p. 197, Note.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Munk discovered a Hebrew abridgment derived from the original Arabic of the *Fons Vitæ* and attributed to Solomon ibn Gabirol, previously known as a liturgical poet. The discovery made a great sensation in its day; Ritter, the historian of philosophy, who had previously denied to Jews any originality in the history of thought, withdrew his allegation owing to the independence of Ibn Gabirol and the influence of his novelties. The chief of these was his assertion of a material substratum to spiritual beings¹ (intelligences have matter as well as form), and consequently that the essence of the Divine Nature was in will rather than in thought.² Now the former view, that not alone corporeal but spiritual substances have both matter and form, is one of the chief points of difference between the Franciscan and the Dominican scholastics, Alexander of Hales and Duns Scotus agreeing with Avicbron (from whom they derived the doctrine) as against Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas. So also

¹ It will be remembered that Spinoza was expelled from the Synagogue because even in youth he held that there was a material substratum to God.

² It is curious to compare the insistence upon the Will to Live and the Will to Power of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche in the post-Kantian philosophy.

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

with regard to the doctrine of the Divine Will, William of Auvergne accepts it in its main features, speaking, in consequence, of Avicbron as "unique and the most noble of all philosophers,"¹ whereas Albertus Magnus opposes Avicbron systematically because radically opposed to Aristotelianism. Dr. Joel accordingly contended that the introduction of Avicbron's novel views was the special ferment in the scholasticism of the thirteenth century which determined the lines of its development. This has been denied by Wittmann,² and seemingly with justice; his influence was more by way of evoking opposition than by compelling imitation.

On the other hand, it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the influence of Maimonides upon the greater scholastics on some of the most vital points of what may be termed their natural theology. It was Alexander of Hales who first introduced Aristotelianism, as represented by the Arabic commentaries, especially of Avicenna, into Christian theology, which he began to systematize in the form of a *Summa*. Now the most strik-

¹ *De Trinitatē*, xii.

² Wittmann, *Die Stellung des heil. Thomas v. Aquin zu Avencebrol*, Münster, 1900.

ing contrast between the Arabic Aristotle and the Bible is with regard to the *creatio exnihilo*, given in Genesis 1-2. This was a problem that had already been dealt with most minutely by Maimonides, who, in his *Guide*, discusses and refutes the arguments in favor of the eternity of the world. Now it is remarkable that Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, all utilize this summary of Maimonides and adopt his arguments, as they themselves acknowledge. The fact is, Judaism and Christianity had both met with the same difficulty which again confronts them to-day. They had to reconcile the doctrine of Evolution with that of Creation. The genius of Maimonides enabled both Church and Synagogue to overcome or evade the opposition and retain allegiance to the Scriptures for another six hundred years.¹

So, too, the introduction of Aristotelian physics into both Jewish and Christian thought raised the problems both of the divine attributes and of divine Providence. The play of forces revealed by physics seemed so different from the

¹ It is again a Jewish philosopher, Henri Bergson, who is nowadays leading the forces against the agnostic tendencies of evolution.

personal Deity revealed by the Scriptures, that the Jewish thinkers, culminating in Maimonides, had to allow that we could only know the existence, not the essence, of the Divine Being, and with regard to His attributes, could only determine these by negation, not affirmation. In these views he is followed, one might almost say slavishly, by the greater scholastics, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas. The Divine Cause revealed by the Aristotelian philosophy was something other than the loving Father revealed in Scripture; and here again Maimonides, by an ingenious distinction, saved the face of Scripture by claiming individual Providence for man alone, whereas in the super-lunary world there was only a general supervision. In this view again he was mostly followed by Albertus and Thomas, though with modifications by the latter. Christian thinkers were also influenced by Maimonides's views on angels and prophecy, perhaps the most ingenious of his speculations, though, with regard to the former topic, both Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas denied that the angels are the intelligences emanating from the Divine Nature.

Thus on some of the most fundamental prob-

lems of theology the great Christian doctors of scholasticism were content to derive their chief arguments from the chief Jewish thinker of the Middle Ages. Indeed it might almost be concluded that the Church had added to her Doctor Angelicus and her Doctor Magnificus the Doctor Perplexorum of the Synagogue who had dealt so ably with some of the main problems that confronted her. Of course, there were whole fields of Christian theology outside the purview of Maimonides, such as the Trinity, the Virgin birth, Original Sin, and the like, but on all the great problems of God's nature and providence, and His creation, Christian scholasticism was content to adopt the views of Moses ben Maimon.¹

Even greater influence, though in a more restricted sphere, was exercised by another movement in Jewish thought, which came to a head in the thirteenth century and is known as the

¹ For details, reference may be given to the works of Guttman mentioned above, or his summary account, *Der Einfluss der maimonidischen Philosophie auf das christliche Abendland*, in the first volume of the work on Maimonides, published by the Gesellschaft zur Foerderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums, Leipsig, 1908. The main points are also given in the monograph by Louis-Germain Lévy on Maimonides, in the series *Les Grands Philosophes*, Paris, 1911, pp. 261-17.

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

Kabbalah. This combined in itself all the mystic elements of the cultures through which Judaism had passed—the ecstasies of the Bible theophanies, the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria, and the Sufism of the Arabs; and in some of its later developments it is not above the suspicion of having been touched by the more mystical aspects of Christianity. Its chief monument, the *Zohar*, was probably put together in the thirteenth century, but contains traces of much earlier strains of mystical doctrine. It attracted the attention of men like Raymond Lully, Pico de la Mirandola, and traces of it are even to be found in Dante. But its chief effect upon European thought was in the period of the Reformation when it served to supply to Protestantism that mystical element which had been the chief attraction in the older forms of faith. A. Stoeckl, in his voluminous *History of Mediæval Philosophy*, devoted a whole section to the analysis of Kabbalistic Theosophy.¹ In combination with a revival of Pythagoreanism it appealed to Reuchlin

¹ Vol. iii, 394-608. He repeats these affiliations in his later and shorter *Lehrbuch zur Gesch. d. Philosophie*. It should be added, however, that he is far from convincing as to the influence of the Kabbalah on Luther.

and Cornelius Agrippa; in connection with the new study of Nature it affected Paracelsus, Cardan, Von Helmont, and Robert Fludd, as well as, one may add, the rest of the Cambridge Platonists; so far as Luther was philosophical, he derived his philosophy from the Kabbalah, with a touch of gnosticism and a coloring of Manichæism, and in this he was followed by Melancthon. The great German mystics, like Weigel and Jakob Boehme, were also kabbalistic in general outline. Just as Catholicism had sought to temper the divine mysteries by the rationalism of Maimonides, so Protestantism, in its turn, modified its rationalistic tendencies by a resort to the mysticism of the Kabbalah.

Meanwhile, within the ranks of Judaism itself, the lines of thought developed by Maimonides were further expanded in a direction which produced a third system of Jewish thought, which had ultimately even greater effects upon European speculation than either Maimonides or the Kabbalah. Levi ben Gerson, whom we have already met with as the inventor of the Jacob's Staff and the Camera Obscura, dared, in his *Wars of the Lord* (called by antagonists *Wars Against the Lord*), to contend for the eternity of the world,

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

against which Maimonides had argued so strenuously. He also held that only the intellectual side of men's natures lasted on beyond their death, deriving this view probably from Averroes, upon whose works he wrote commentaries. Against his views there came a protest by Hasdai Crescas, who, nevertheless, held that extension was one of the attributes of the Divine; he denied final causes, and contended for a strict determinism. These views, with much derived from the Kabbalah and even from Maimonides, were cast into a Cartesian mould by Baruch Spinoza, who sums up the whole line of Jewish thought, into which he incorporated a few hints from Bruno, Hobbes, and Descartes.¹

His influence upon European speculation has been simply enormous, even up to the present day. Through personal intercourse with Leibniz in the last year of his life,² he gave the determining influence to that thinker's view, which was destined to dominate the whole of the eighteenth century philosophy. After Kant, the chief epigoni,

¹ For a detailed account of Spinoza's indebtedness to his Jewish predecessors I may perhaps refer to my article on him in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, xi, 517-18.

² See L. Stein, *Leibnitz und Spinoza*, Berlin, 1890; and compare B. Russell, *Philosophy of Leibniz*, Cambridge, 1900, p. 5.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, were mainly occupied in grafting the pantheism of Spinoza on the epistemology of Kant; Hegel even declared that to be a philosopher one must first be a Spinozist. His influence was even as great among the less formal thinkers, like Lessing, Goethe, Schleiermacher, as well as among poets and essayists, like Shelley, Byron, Coleridge, Auerbach, Matthew Arnold, Froude, George Eliot, and Renan.

Spinoza's influence has even extended to the fundamental principles of contemporary science, which, by a happy divination, he anticipated in many respects as regards the conservation of energy, the importance of conation as the essence of evolution, and the aspect of the universe as a combination of configurations and motions.¹ Accordingly, natural philosophers like Herbert Spencer, Haeckel, and Ostwald have practically adopted Spinoza as the basis of their thinking. It is a curious coincidence that the main opposition to this deterministic and pantheistic view

¹ Even the infinity of attributes, one of the most startling points in Spinoza's system, may be regarded as a premonition of the recognition by modern mathematicians of the infinity of non-Euclidean spaces.

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

of the universe nowadays comes from the "creative evolution" of another Jewish thinker, Henri Bergson.

But quite apart from the direct influence on European thought and thinkers of the three great systems of Maimonides, the Kabbalah, and Spinoza, the mere existence and sufferings of a body of men, like the Jews, daring to differ from the Christian consensus must have made a deep impression upon the imagination of mediæval Europe. These men were risking death, and, what was more, were choosing degraded and segregated lives solely for the sake of what they conceived to be the truth. Men like Roger Bacon, Lully, Bruno, and Servetus must have been supported, in their struggle with the Church, by the consciousness that they were not risking more than the Jewish thinkers with whom each of them was, at some time in his life, acquainted. In this sense the Jews, by their very existence, were a standing incitement to freedom of thought, though within their own circles they were often as intolerant as their Christian neighbors.

We have already seen that the Averroism of the school of Padua, which brought the scepticism of the Renaissance to its height in the

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

denial of immortality by Pomponati, was mainly due to the activity of Jewish translators into Latin of the Hebrew versions of Averroes. This is not the sole contribution of Jews to Renaissance thought. The Humanists, like Poggio Bracciolati, and Giannozzo Mannetti, his son Agnolo, and Pico de la Mirandola, devoted almost as much attention to Hebrew learning as to Greek,¹ and we have already seen how the last-named utilized the Kabbalah, which probably also had its influence on Giordano Bruno. But the influence of the Renaissance upon the Jews is even more marked than their influence upon the Renaissance. Giuda Romano even adopted scholasticism, while his cousin Manoello, a friend of Dante, wrote a kind of Divine Comedy in Hebrew, besides bewailing Dante's death in an Italian sonnet. Messer Leon, in his rhetoric, *Nofet Zufim*, used Quintilian and Cicero as models, and it is characteristic that this work, the only one of a living author printed in the fifteenth century, was of a distinctly humanistic character. But perhaps the most characteristic product of this Jewish Renaissance, as we may call it, was the *Dialoghi di Amore* of Don Judah Abarbanel,

¹ See Burckhardt, *Civilization of the Renaissance*, ii, pp. 197-9.

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

known as Messer Leone Hebreo, which appeared in Venice, 1535, and went through numerous editions, and was translated into Latin, French, and Spanish. What we call Platonic love was really derived from this curious treatise of Abarbanel, which is frequently quoted and referred to by Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*.

This influence of the Renaissance on the Jews is far from isolated as an instance of the way in which European movements affected European Jews quite throughout the Middle Ages. This is shown most conspicuously in their translating activity, especially in what I have called above their "terminal" translations, which were not used to pass on knowledge to the Christian world and went no further than the Hebrew. In Steinschneider's work on Jewish translations he has, in each of the four sections (philosophy, mathematics, medicine, and miscellaneous) a chapter devoted to the Christians whose works have been translated into Hebrew, and in mathematics and medicine these outnumber those translated from the Arabic. Albertus Magnus, Duns Scotus, Michael Scot, Raymond Lully, Thomas Aquinas, among philosophers; Sacrobosco and Regiomon-

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

tanus, among mathematicians; Arnold di Villanova, Constantinus Afer, Julius of Salerno, Maurus of Salerno, Roger and Roland of Parma, and Saladin of Salerno, in medicine; besides many others, even less familiar, were all rendered accessible to the mediæval Jews in Hebrew translations. Even some of the Arthurian romances and Marie de France's fables were adapted and made current among the Jews; for example, the romance of Sir Bevis of Hamton was current among the German Jews under the title of *Bovobuch*. In their more original works they often showed European, as well as Arabic, influences; if their poetry was mainly liturgical, there was much of it of a secular nature, and occasionally they wrote in the vernaculars of their native country; there is even a Jewish Minnesinger, Süsskind von Trimberg, unknown to Richard Wagner and Mr. Chamberlain. Through the intimate relations of Hebrew and Arabic they were fortunately able to make their grammatical studies the beginnings of comparative philology.¹ The very polemics and disputations which they carried on with Muslims and Christians made it

¹ A. H. Sayce, *Treatise on Comparative Philology*.

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

necessary for them to acquire a knowledge of the rival religions, and it is recognized that the sketches made of them in Judah ha-Levi's *al-Khazari* are models of fairness and impartiality. In short, there was a natural and human give-and-take in the intellectual relations of European Jews and Christians.

Of course it would be possible to exaggerate both sides of these movements and claim, with Lecky and Draper, that all independent thinking and research in mediæval Europe was due to the impact of Arabic thought brought about by Jewish intermediation. Or, on the other hand, Jews may be regarded, as by Mr. Chamberlain and others, as merely encamped in Europe, like the Turks, without any intellectual communion with the rest of their fellow-countrymen. The latter position is simply gratuitously insolent and is sufficiently refuted by the innumerable instances of Jewish influence upon European movements given in the present and the preceding chapters. It is, perhaps, more necessary to moderate the excessive claims that may be made that mediæval thought and science were dominated by Jewish influence. It has been customary, in this connection, to reckon in the whole

translating activity of mediæval Jews, which certainly produces a very impressive effect, but, by making a careful distinction, as I have done, between "terminals" and "junctions," we see that the former can only be adduced to prove, not the influence of Jews upon Europe, but rather the influence of both Arabia and Europe upon the Jews. We have, accordingly, seen that the main "junctions," which Jews can claim as passing on Arabic knowledge to the schools of Europe, were through John of Seville in the twelfth century, Andrew, Michael Scot's dragoman, in the twelfth century, and the translators of Averroes in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Elia del Medigo, Jacob Mantino, and Abraham de Balmes. The Averroism of the Middle Ages was neither as important as Renan claimed, nor was it due entirely to the Jews.

On the other hand, we have seen that the introduction of Indian arithmetic and geometry into Europe was due to John of Seville and Abraham bar Hiyya. It was even shown to be probable that the Jew was the medium through which the Indian numerals were first brought to the Arabic world, along with Indian fables and Indian chess. Practically all the astronomical tables which were

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

used by astronomers, astrologers, map-makers, and mariners (including Columbus in the last-named) were made by Jews, who also contributed some of the more important Portulani by which the seamen steered. So, too, the chief instruments used for taking observations on board, the Jacob's Staff and the new quadrant, were due to Levi ben Gerson and Jacob ben Makir; to the former we have been enabled to trace the first description, if not the invention, of the Camera Obscura. As regards medical theory, there is little that can be directly traced to Jews except through the translations of Isaac Israeli on Fever and of Maimonides on Dietetics; their help in founding the schools of Salerno and Montpellier still remains to be proven.

But if we have seen reason to moderate the claims made for Jews as intermediaries between Islam and Christendom in science and philosophy, our inquiries have rather raised than lessened the debt which Christian theology owes to independent Jewish thinkers like Ibn Gabirol, Maimonides, the Masters of the Kabbalah, and Spinoza. While it would be going too far to state, with some Jewish inquirers, that Avicenna (Ibn Gabirol) was the ferment of the thirteenth

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

century scholasticism, his original thought had a certain influence on the greater scholastics, and it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the influence of Maimonides on their views of Creation, Providence, and Prophecy. He had had to deal with the same problems as Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, earlier than they, and it was to be expected that they should adopt his solutions about points of natural theology which were entirely common to the two faiths. If Stoeckl, the historian of mediæval philosophy, is to be believed, the whole of Reformation theology was permeated by kabbalistic influences, and it is notorious that modern thought is equally permeated by Spinozism, which, in a measure, sums up the whole development of Jewish metaphysics during the Middle Ages.

The above contributions constitute considerable factors in the making of mediæval Europe. But it would be misleading to exaggerate their extent. Owing to their careful segregation, there were whole spheres of mediæval life in which Jews were prevented from participating. Even in the pagan empire they had, by their own choice, been exempted from bearing arms, and thus in the Holy Roman empire they were out-

side the whole system of feudalism and chivalry. European art and music were entirely religious, that is, Christian, and here again Jews were excluded from taking any part, though there was probably some influence of Synagogue cantillation on the Gregorian chants. Though they spoke the vernaculars, they had little inducement to write in these languages for purely literary purposes, and it was obviously impossible for them to share in the glories of the great cathedrals raised to the honor of the saints of the Christian Church. Even in the sphere of thought they had nothing to do with the cathedral schools and university colleges that monopolized the higher education of mediæval Europe.

No, the Jews took their part in the European culture of the Middle Ages, but that part was restricted by their special relations to the Church-State. In some directions, as in mathematics and astronomy, in theoretical navigation, and natural theology, and in the earlier phases of intermediation between East and West, they did even more than their fair share as compared with other races and nations. It is doubtful, for example, whether mediæval England or Germany could contribute such a list of mathematicians and as-

tronomers up to the year 1500 as is given in Miss Goldberg's index to Steinschneider's *Mathematik bei den Juden*, running to 252 names, though mediæval Englishmen were probably five times, and mediæval Germans ten times, as numerous as the European Jews of the Middle Ages.¹ If they contributed nothing to art, architecture, and literature, if they were outside the field of arms, this was mainly due to their exclusion from any sphere within the influence of the Church. Using the vernaculars of their native countries, they could not avoid being assimilated in the folkways of their fellow-countrymen, even with regard to their superstitions; but it must be confessed that they gave as good as they took, at any rate in the intellectual sphere.

They were enabled to do these services to Europe by their peculiar position in the State systems of Islam and Christendom, which enabled them to be an intermediary between them. It was because they were intermediaries in commerce that they were enabled to be inter-

¹ On the other hand, Jews cannot claim as many thinkers of the importance of Alcuin, John Scotus, Anselm, John of Salisbury, Alexander of Hales, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and Occam; here the qualitative superiority seems to be on the side of the Englishman.

INFLUENCE OF JEWISH THOUGHT

mediaries in thought, and we have still to ascertain, in some detail, the economic rôle played by the intermediary Jews in Europe, partly by their control of the trade routes between East and West, and partly by the position forced upon them by the Church attitude toward capitalism, stigmatized as "usury." This will form the subject of our next chapter.

CHAPTER VI

JEWS AND COMMERCE

IT is usually assumed that there is a natural tendency in the Jewish character toward commerce. This was certainly not the case in Bible times. The Israelites, perched up on highlands, far from the two main caravan routes, from Damascus to Egypt, had little occasion to engage in traffic. Each household produced all the food, clothing, timber, and tools it needed, and only for a few luxuries did it have resort to "wanderers," known invariably as foreigners—Canaanites,¹ Midianites,² and Ishmaelites.³ The mere fact that there was no coined money used in Israel until the time of the Maccabees would be alone sufficient to prove how little trade was current among the Israelites. How little popular it was, even in the times of the Mishnah (first two centuries, C.E.), is shown in the maxims, "Have

¹ Job 40, 30; Proverbs 31, 24.

² Genesis 37, 28.

³ Genesis 37, 25.

little business";¹ "The less trading, the more Torah."² The ideal of the Israelite was to repose in the shade of his own fig-tree, but not to have a large number of figs to trade with. Josephus gives the reason: "We do not dwell in a land by the sea and do not therefore indulge in commerce either by sea or otherwise."³

It is to the dispersion and wanderings of the Jews that we can trace the growth of a taste or addiction to trading as a means of livelihood. It is indeed extraordinary how widespread the Jewish communities had become by the end of the first century.⁴ They were the only body of men in the Roman empire who could retain their communion and identity, while so widely dispersed, because of their religion, which had no trace of local restriction, like all the other cults of antiquity. A Jew could worship God in Antioch, Alexandria, or Rome, whereas an Athenian would feel himself debarred from communion

¹ Abot 4, 14.

² *Ibid.*, 6, 6.

³ *Contra Apionem*, i, 12.

⁴ The latest enumeration is that given by J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain*, i, pp. 180-209, mainly from recently discovered inscriptions. Less complete accounts in Schürer and T. Reinach *s.v.* "Diaspora" in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, iv, 561-2.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

with Athena unless he resided within an easy access of the Acropolis, or of a similar fane in one of the Athenian colonies. Yet most Jews retained the practice of visiting the Temple, enjoined by the Law, and this would lead to just those wandering tendencies which, in biblical times, they had associated with the alien merchant. Their concentration, too, when sold as slaves, in the imperial towns would tend to divorce them, for the most part, from the pastoral and agricultural life to which they had hitherto been accustomed, and we accordingly find them in the Roman empire also artisans and small traders as well as farmers and colonists.

Except, however, in Egypt, where they are found as important merchants in Alexandria, almost from the foundation of the city, there is no evidence of any exclusive or predominant addiction to commerce on the part of Jews till the rise of Islam in the seventh century. Still less is there any evidence before that time of a tendency toward general trading for speculative purposes; previously we find them restricting their commercial activity to one particular line of goods. The earliest instance of such general trading I find in connection with one of the seven wonders of the

world.¹ When the Colossus of Rhodes fell in 653 it was a Jewish merchant of Emessa who purchased the débris and carried it off on nine hundred camels.²

Though in the early days of Islam the motive for conquest appears to have been, according to modern research, rather tribute than conversion, as soon as the various Emirates were organized, the greatest pressure was brought to bear upon the non-faithful to induce them to accept Islam. It is true that Christians (and "Sabæans"), as well as Jews, as "People with Scriptures," were also permitted to reside among Muslim peoples, though with certain disabilities. But Jews had been used to similar restrictions previously, whereas Christians found it hard to accept the yoke of the Muslim. Any movement backward and forward of Christians from the Muslim states would naturally be regarded with suspicion when there was practically a perpetual state of war between the countries of the Crescent and the Cross. Besides, the Christians of the East were Nestorians, Jacobites, or Orthodox, and regarded as heretics by those of the West. In

¹ See J. Juster, *op. cit.* ii, 294-309.

² Paulus Diaconus, 656.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Christian lands the peaceful presence of a Muhammedan was scarcely conceivable till the tide of Spanish conquest brought the Moriscos under Christian domination. Accordingly, the Jew was the only person who could pass freely from the Muslim to the Christian sphere of influence. Thus in less than a couple of centuries after the Hegira we find him practically monopolizing the trade between the two spheres.

In 847 the Postmaster-General of the Caliphate of Bagdad, named Ibn Khordadbeh, wrote, in his *Book of Ways*,¹ a full description of the routes taken by such Jewish intermediaries; his account, as we shall see, gives the key to the whole economic history of the Jews in the Middle Ages, and therefore deserves to be given here in its entirety.²

“ROUTES OF THE JEWISH MERCHANTS CALLED RADANITES

These merchants speak Arabic, Persian, Roman (Greek), the language of the Franks, Andalusians, and Slavs. They journey from west

¹ De Goeje's edition in *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*, vi, 114.

² Prof. I. Friedlaender has been good enough to check my translation and supplement my information in numerous ways.

to east, from east to west, partly on land, partly by sea. They transport from the west eunuchs, female and male slaves, silk, castor, marten and other furs, and swords. They take ship in the land of the Franks, on the Western Sea, and steer for Farama (Pelusium). There they load their goods on the backs of camels and go by land to Kolzum (Suez) in five days' journey over a distance of twenty-five parasangs. They embark in the East Sea (Red Sea), and sail from Kolzum to El-Jar (port of Medina) and Jeddah (port of Mecca); then they go to Sind, India, and China. On their return they carry back musk, aloes, camphor, cinnamon, and other products of the Eastern countries to Kolzum, and bring them to Farama, where they again embark on the Western Sea. Some make sail for Constantinople to sell their goods to the Romans; others go to the palace of the king of the Franks to place their goods.

Sometimes these Jew merchants prefer to carry their goods from the land of the Franks in the Western Sea, making for Antioch (at the mouth of the Orontes); thence they go by land to Al-Jabia (?), where they arrive after three days' march. There they embark on the Eu-

phrates for Bagdad, and then sail down the Tigris to al-Obolla. From al-Obolla they sail for Oman, Sind, Hind, and China. All this is connected one with another.

These different journeys can also be made by land. The merchants that start from Spain or France go to Sous al-Akza (Morocco), and then to Tangiers, whence they march to Kairuwan and the capital of Egypt. Thence they go to al-Ramla, visit Damascus, al-Kufa, Bagdad, and Basrah, cross Ahwaz, Fars, Kirman, Sind, Hind, and arrive at China. Sometimes they likewise take the route behind Rome, and, passing through the country of the Slavs, arrive at Khamlij, the capital of the Khazars. They embark on the Jorjan Sea, arrive at Balkh, betake themselves from there across the Oxus, and continue their journey toward the Yourts of the Toghozghor, and from there to China."

It will be observed that these Jewish merchants are called Radanites¹; and one of the languages with which they are credited is Persian, so that it would seem that their headquarters were in Persia. It has accordingly been determined that

¹ From Persian *rah dan*, knowing the way.

their headquarters were in the town of Rhaga,¹ near Teheran (the Rhages of Tobit's birthplace), which was in the ninth century the commercial metropolis of Persia, from which caravans went to Armenia, Khorassan and Khazaria.² At the latter place they would connect with the Jewish merchants who, according to Ibrahim ibn Ya'kub.³ carried wares from Byzantium to Prague and there exchanged them for fur, metals, and slaves. It will be observed that all the routes of these "Radanites" ended in China, and this is confirmed by the fact that the ritual of the Chinese Jews shows clear marks of Persian influence. We know that they suffered in the sack of Quinsay, 878.⁴ A little later Benjamin of Tudela refers to Jews in China, and there are still traces of them at Kaifung-fu, and earlier they were to be found at Kanfu and Hangchau. They appear to have arrived there very early, perhaps in the first Christian century, re-

¹ When destroyed by Ghinkhiz Khan in the thirteenth century, it claimed half a million inhabitants (Hammer, *Gold. Horde*, 77). Ibn Fakih (De Goeje, *loc. cit.*, v, 270) places his account of the Radanites in connection with al-Ray.

² Ritter, *Asien*, vi, i, 595.

³ Quoted by G. Jacob, *Handelsartikel der Araber*, p. 9.

⁴ Beazley, *Dawn*.

taining certain ceremonials (chair and veil of Moses), which have disappeared among Jews but are referred to in the New Testament. We accordingly, in nearly contemporary accounts, find them scattered on these main routes, from Arabia to China, at Bokhara, Khotan, and Samrakand, at Kis and at Cranganore, at Quilon and Zayton.¹

The character of the goods the Radanites transported from East to West also deserves attention. The drugs, perfumes, and condiments they brought to Europe could not be obtained there, though the last-named were absolutely essential to give some taste to the salt meats of winter and the salt fish of Lent. The musk and other perfumes were equally necessary to overcome the stuffy atmosphere and unsanitary habits of the mediæval castles. It is perhaps worth while interpolating here an explanation why the Jewish Radanites, who seemed so important in the ninth century, left so little trace of their influence on international commerce in later times. Almost immediately after Ibn Khordadbeh wrote his account there were

¹ The date of the brass "Sasanarn" giving them feudal rights is 750.

riots in China (878 C.E.) against foreign merchants, which would for a time put an end to the Radanite commerce. In the next century most of the Slav lands where these Jewish merchants obtained their slaves were Christianized and thus largely excluded from the slave trade, while the same century saw the fall of Khazaria through the Varangians, and the Radanite trade, through the close connection of Rhaga with the Caspian Sea, evidently depended largely upon the favor of the Jewish kings of Khazaria. Toward the end of the tenth century again the Sammanides, who ruled the district around Khiva, the gateway to Chinese trade, fell before the Tartars, who formed henceforth a barrier against Western traders. Finally, the tenth century saw the rise of Venice, which took the place of the Radanites in the Mediterranean trade. Through these means the Radanites lost their monopoly of international trade, though in the meantime they had amassed that wealth in gold which enabled them to become the bankers of Europe when Europe needed money.

In exchange for these, these Jewish merchants brought chiefly slaves from the Frank and the Slav lands, and even before the rise of Islam

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Jews had become connected with this wretched trade, as we can see from Pope Gregory and Gregory of Tours. The Church vigorously protested against this, but not from humanitarian reasons, since Christians were allowed to hold slaves, but for fear that Christian slaves should be converted to Judaism, or even the pagan slaves should thus be added to the Jewish forces. The object is plainly stated in Justinian's Novella, xxxvii, which declares that not alone Jews but Arians, Donatists, and pagans should not be allowed to hold Christian slaves. Nevertheless, the rulers of Christian states found it impossible to carry out the Church's wishes in this regard, and up to the tenth century Jews were the chief slave-dealers of Europe and were thus indirectly the cause of introducing Christianity into England, according to the well-known anecdote. In the tenth century their place in the slave trade was taken by Amalfitani and Venetians. The latter would, during the course of this century, tend to exclude more and more completely Jews from the Oriental trade. In 964 they prohibited Venetian vessels from carrying Jewish passengers to Byzantium; in 992 they extended the prohibition to Jewish goods.

JEWES AND COMMERCE

It would be interesting in this connection to determine the amount of Jewish intermediation with regard to the influence of Arabia in producing what we term personal refinement. Mr. Houston Chamberlain and thinkers of his school may be distressed to learn that what we know as refinement, that is, careful personal choice in the material surroundings of our lives, can be traced not to the Teutonic Goths and Vandals but to the Semitic Saracens. Before the twelfth century, the homes, even of the higher classes in Europe, were nearly as bare and rude as those of savages; their food was of the most primitive kind, without variety, and consisting in winter mainly of salted meat, owing to the impossibility of keeping fodder for any but the sires and dams. Almost all the luxuries that came in about that time were from the East, as can be seen even at the present day by the derivation of their names. In material for clothes they thus obtained cotton, silk, velvet, satin (from Zayton), damask, cashmere, camlet, muslin (from Mosul), chintz, moire, taffeta, gingham, chiffon, serge, craimaisy, mohair; and in articles of dress, sash, shawl, chemise, tiara, mask, and turban; in house decoration we have carpets, tapestry, mattress,

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

sofa, divan, alcove, baldaquin (from Badgad), and lacquer work, besides carafe, cup (French, Tasse), jar, candle (French, bougie), and valise; among table fruits we owe to the Arabs mulberries, pistachios, figs, citrons, watermelons, apricots, damsons, oranges, peaches, lemons, and limes; among vegetables, the artichoke, asparagus, spinach, and eschalet (from Askalon), as well as rice; among flowers, the lilac, rose, jasmine, and tulip. Some of the more domestic musical instruments, like the lute, the tambour, tambourine, and rebeck, come from the same source; of precious stones, the ruby, turquoise, amber, jasper, jade, and lapislazuli; while all spices, pomades, and cosmetics, and many dyes, including indigo (from India), are Eastern in origin. In medicine, the Arabs introduced syrups and julep, nitre and soda, senna and camphor, alum and borax, tamarinds and laudanum, and mercury as a drug. Many of these objects were doubtless introduced after the Crusades, but some of them can be shown to have been used in Europe before the twelfth century, and in these cases their introduction was probably due to the Radanites. I have drawn out a list of some thousand objects whose names, in the various

European languages, can be derived from Oriental tongues.¹

Out of these one may fairly attribute to the influence of the Radanites the introduction of objects which are mentioned before the eleventh century in writers like al-Mas'udi, al-Kindi, Istakhri, Avicenna, Isaac Israeli, or Constantinus Afer. Again, words derived from the Persian through the Arabic or the Greek are likely to be early, since, later on, the loans were in the opposite direction.

Judging by these criteria, Europe owes to the Jewish Radanites the introduction of oranges and apricots, sugar and rice, Jargonelle pears, and Gueldre roses, senna and borax, bdellium and asa-fœtida, sandal-wood and aloes, cinnamon and galingale, mace and camphor, candy and julep, cubebs and tamarinds, slippers and tambours, mattress, sofa, and calabash, musk and jujube, jasmine and lilac. There is also evidence that some of the more important items of foreign

¹ For English I have used Skeat; for French, Devic's supplement to Littré, and Lammens, *Remarques sur les Mots Français*, Beyrout, 1890; for Spanish and Portuguese, Dozy and Engelmann; for Dutch, Dozy, *Oosterlingen*, Leyden, 1867; for Anglo-Indian, Yule's *Glossary*; and for Elizabethan commerce, Barrett's list in Hakluyt, ii, 127.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

trade came in with the Radanites, as was perhaps natural. Thus the word "douane," for custom house, "tariff," "bazaar," "bale," "fondac," or factory, and "baggage," all occur early, as well as "barge," "barque," and "sloop" (Lammens). There is also probability that the royal breed of horses in France known as limousin, introduced in the ninth century, was due to these Jewish merchants, who exchanged French slaves in Spain for Arab (really Barbary) horses, with bay color, small heads, white stockings, and curved tails.¹ On the debit side, however, there is probably to be found the introduction of opium into China from India, with its Arabic name "A-fu-yung," at the beginning of the ninth century.²

These wandering Jewish merchants, who brought Eastern luxuries into Europe and took back furs, young slaves, and non-precious metals to Saracen countries, would mainly conduct their business for cash. Most of the ordinary transactions of the time were carried out in kind or, in other words, by barter. Now money was in those

¹ See Ridgeway, *Origin of the Thoroughbred Horse*, and Pigeonneau, *Histoire du Commerce*. The croup of a horse is, according to Lammens, of Arabic origin, and so is "to caracole."

² Yule, *s.v.*

days only to be found in the towns, chiefly in the market towns, and accordingly it is only in these that Jews were to be found in the Middle Ages. The manors were a compromise between the Military and the Clan State, in neither of which the Jew had a place, and therefore he could neither do military service for a fief nor hold a farm under a "lord." Thus the whole constitution of mediæval Christendom forced the Jews into the towns, and prepared them for the function of helping to transform the economics of Europe from a barter to a money system.

This transition came in Western Europe mainly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It spread from the king as head of the Military State downwards; he found it more efficient to keep an army of mercenaries under his continual control than to depend upon the often unwilling service of his vassals. Hence the increasing practice of commuting the duty of military service for a fixed sum (named "scutage" in England), and this later on led to general taxation not alone of vassals but of all persons living in the territory under the control of the king.¹ The same practice

¹ As in the Saladdin tithe in England; see Jenks, *Law and Politics*, p. 95.

was soon followed by abbeys and monasteries who desired to build, and by the superior nobles who wished to have a force at command, or desired to build castles, or to go on crusade. For all these purposes, warfare, taxation, building, or crusading, actual cash was much more efficient than aids in kind or service. Hence the twelfth century sees the rise, in Western Europe, of a money-economy instead of a barter-economy.

But where were kings, nobles, and clergy to get any large sums of coin? Those who possessed coin would not lend it in most cases without some compensation for risk and loss of use, which we nowadays call interest or profit. But the Church had definitely set its face against all taking of interest, regarding it as unjust to sell something which doesn't exist (Thomas Aquinas).¹ Usury, as all taking of interest was called, was

¹ T. Reinach elaborately argues, in *Revue des Études Juives*, vi, p. 141, that this is due to the Vulgate mistranslation of Luke 6, 14; but it is simpler to regard it as due to the direct prohibition of Exodus 22, 24. See M. Hoffmann, *Geldhandel der deutschen Juden*, Leipzig, 1910, to which I am much indebted for what follows. It is just possible that the stringency of Church doctrine was influenced, as in the case of the badge, by Muslim views. See E. Cohn, *Der Wucher (Riba) in Quoran, Chadith und Fiqh*, Heidelberg, 1903; B. Fekar, *L'usure en droit musulman*, Lyons, 1908.

regarded as "mercatura illicita," and Church council after Church council thundered against its practice by Christians who were *ipso facto* rendered excommunicate. Lay usurers were threatened with infamy and put on the same level as murderers and adulterers, being excluded from religious burial. Churchmen who indulged in the practice were to be deprived of their benefices. Strangely enough, it was allowed to take usury from heathens or Jews, as being outside the Christian communion and therefore "perpetual enemies" ("Ubi jus belli, ibi jus usuræ").

The Church was thinking more of the conditions of an agricultural community in which loans are more precarious and usury more dangerous than in other spheres of economics.¹ But for any kind of industrial progress this restriction of banking facilities was a great check on economic progress. In particular, building operations, which were the chief form of large transactions (as well as of art) in the Middle Ages, could hardly be undertaken without unusual expendi-

¹This is brought out clearly by the Catholic theologian Funk in his *Zins und Wucher*. See W. J. Ashley, *Introduction to English Economic History and Theory*, Book I, chapter vi, who is inclined to defend the Church prohibition of usury for mediæval conditions.

ture of money, which scarcely any private persons would be able to accumulate.

Here came in the function of the Jew in mediæval economics, who was not affected by the Church prohibitions and was equally unaffected by any prohibition of rabbinic law against lending to Gentiles, though the biblical command not to lend to brother Jews was rigidly adhered to. Nor could the Church prevent the practice of Jewish usury, since Jews were outside of the sphere of the Canon law. Hence we find, from the twelfth century onwards, Jews as the recognized money-lenders, to whom all the upper classes of society resorted whenever they wished to build, or travel, or fight; the lower classes still, for the most part, paid for their living in service or kind, and existed on a barter-economy. To give just a few examples from England, nine of the Cistercine monasteries and the abbey of St. Albans were all built by monies advanced by Aaron of Lincoln, the great Jewish financier of the twelfth century.

The interest granted for such loans was indeed high and might fairly be termed usurious. When fixed by law in Germany and England, it was rarely below $43\frac{1}{3}$ per cent when the sole secur-

ity was the debtor's word or bond. But it must be remembered that Jews in particular underwent great risks, as they were often repaid in bad or clipped money, and had to bribe or pay law costs to recover their money, while, if the debtor died, his heirs might not recognize the debt, or his overlord might seize his whole property.

Above all, the Jew was continuously subject to exactions from the kings and emperors, who, as we have seen (Chapter III), regarded them as part of their "eminent domain." All property of a usurer who died escheated to the king, whether he were Jew or Gentile, so that the property of a Jewish usurer was always potentially the property of the king from this point of view, quite apart from his peculiar status as perpetual enemy. But in allowing the Jew to sue for his usurious debt in the king's courts, the kings naturally claimed their dues, and, in addition, taxed them to an amount which was never under a fifth and often reached as much as a quarter or a third of their income. In addition, popes and kings and even nobles and clergy, who had Jews under their jurisdiction, claimed the right, quite arbitrarily, to remit interest or even the

whole debt, as Philip Augustus did in 1180, on condition that the debtors of the Jews should pay part of their debts into the royal treasury. As a consequence, we find about one-twelfth of the royal income derived directly, or indirectly, from Jewish usury.¹ Small comparatively as this fraction was, it was constitutionally of considerable importance, since this source of income was entirely under the king's control and very often enabled him to exercise influence upon such of his nobles or of the towns as had got into the hands of "his" Jews. In fact, in this way the kings of England and Spain, and to a less extent the kings of France and the emperors of the Holy Roman empire, became the arch-usurers of their realms.

The Jews, however, had far from monopoly of usurious loans. Lamprecht,² indeed, contends that up to the twelfth century the chief loans were mainly made by the clergy; up to the thirteenth by citizens and nobles; and only in the fourteenth by Jews. This distinction, however, is too rigid, as already in the twelfth century we find the right of trading debarred to Jews in

¹ For England, see Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*. For Germany, Hoffmann. For Spain, Jacobs, *Spanish Jewish History*.

² *Deutsches Wirtschaftsleben in Mittelalter*, i, pp. 1446, seq.

the charters, and instances of money-lending by them are found even earlier. Besides, throughout the period from 1100 to 1350, during which Europe changed from a barter-economy to a money-economy, usurious loans were illicit and secret by Christians, permitted and enforced by the courts when made by Jews. On the other hand, Bourgelot declares that the Jews were solely money-lenders, whereas Lombards were money-changers and Cahorsins small bankers. This distinction does not hold, since we find Lombards and Cahorsins lending money and Jews changing it.

For by the thirteenth century direct and open competition came into the money-lending business through those whom the Jews themselves called "the pope's usurers."¹ One of the needs for a cash economy was for the payment of Peter's pence and other papal dues to Rome. Bankers on a large scale from Rome, Siena, Florence, Este, Pisa, and Pistoja, mostly in connection with the Roman Curia, and known collectively as "Lombards," agreed with the ecclesiastical debtors of the papal court at the fairs of Champagne to pay their debts at Rome and let the indebtedness run on from fair to fair at the rate of 10 per cent, or

¹ Matt. Paris, ed. Luard.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

60 per cent per annum. Money-lenders on a smaller scale, named Cahorsins, after Cahors, but mostly coming from Asti and Cheri, were more direct competitors of the Jews as usurers, and represent the whole class in Dante; but their numbers were comparatively small (only four, for example, were existent at Constance in 1282), and hence there were no popular uprisings against them.

These Lombards (after whom Lombard Street, the banking quarter of London, is called) were the direct rivals of the Jews in supplying the abbeys and nobles with monies intended for payment in Rome. Hence the Jews protested against their admission in London, in 1255, and in Cologne, in 1266; but in vain. Behind the Lombards was the power of the Roman Curia, which often threatened excommunication to those who did not pay their debts, however usurious. As the thirteenth century passed on, the competition of the Lombards became more serious, and when the Black Death in the middle of the fourteenth century had wiped out many of the German communities, the Italian bankers and their imitators at Augsburg and Nuremberg en-

tirely ousted the Jews from the larger fields of money-lending.

Meanwhile in England and France Jews had been expelled, to a large extent, because the experiment of using them as indirect tax-gatherers and illicit bankers had proved too expensive and against the public conscience. The feudal system kept Jews out of the country and the farms. The guild system prevented them from earning their living as industrials, or even as merchants, because these guilds were religious fraternities, arranging for masses of the souls of dead members, as well as trade organizations. Consequently, when it was decided that the Jewish usury was objectionable and too expensive, the only alternative was expulsion, which occurred in England in 1290, in France in 1306 (and later dates), and in Germany, in various sporadic cases, in the different cities which had comparative autonomy from the rule of the emperors. In Spain fearful persecutions, in 1391, largely wiped out the Jewish population as Jews, though leaving the converted remnant to continue their financial activities as Marranos.

We may now attempt to measure, to some extent, the influence of Jewish usury upon the eco-

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

conomic development of the Middle Ages from 1100 to 1400. They certainly helped the transition from a barter-economy to a money-economy, in which, during that period, they had, to a large extent, a monopoly. Of course, loans were made, both with and without interest, by Gentiles under various forms, which evaded the prohibition of usury, or really did not come under that term as conceived by Canonists. But in anything like a speculative employment of capital for purely industrial or trade purposes, the Jews were almost the sole bankers, where credit was required without fluid collateral or pledge. Even where normal loans were usual between Christians, the Jews probably reduced the current rate of interest. Thus in North Germany, where there were no Jews, 10 per cent was regarded as a usual return for the use of capital with secure collateral, whereas in South Germany, where there was Jewish competition, such interest was between $4\frac{1}{2}$ and $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; in Kiel, where there were no Jews, the ordinary interest in the thirteenth century was between 15 and $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent; in Lindau interest was charged by Christian merchants even to the amount of 216 per cent per annum, so that the citizens begged for the admission of

Jews into the town as a remedy for this intolerable state of things.¹

It would, however, be a mistake to regard the mediæval Jews as the originators of banks, properly so called, that is institutions which receive other people's monies and lend them out. These can be distinctly traced to the Italian towns, Genoa, Florence, and Venice; and even Sombart has failed to prove any connection of Jews with the beginnings of banking in these towns. The question whether they originated bills of exchange is still under discussion, though there is something like them in talmudic law.² The late Prof. Charles Gross pointed out that the transference of debts from one Jew to another had something like the effect of increasing the currency, but such transfers were by no means frequent. Roscher and Scherer contend that the legal principle, that sales made *bona fide* in market overt are valid, is derived from the Jewish practice of money-lenders in the Middle Ages, and shows the influence of talmudic law. Indirectly, modern pawn-broking may be said to be derived from the Jewish usury of the Middle Ages, because the Monte

¹ Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

² Ketubot 101b; Baba Batra 172a.

di Pieta of Italy were mainly founded in order to protect the common people from the high rates charged by Jewish money-lenders.¹ But this was rather later than the period we are at present considering, when Jews, by the competition of Lombards, had been reduced from unlicensed bankers to pedlars and pawn-brokers, which was their main occupation in Mid-Europe after the Black Death.

Perhaps the most important influence of mediæval Jewish usury was in the effect it had upon the king's position with regard to his subjects. It gave him a sure source of income, which, though probably not more than one-tenth of the whole amount, was free from any direct interference on the part of his subjects. So far as this helped to consolidate the nation by making the king's power effective in all quarters of the land, it helped the general growth of nationalities, which were ultimately destined to break up the uniformity of the Middle Ages.

Economically, however, the part taken by Jewish usury, though important in its tendency, was probably not large in extent. It is probable that 90 per cent of the inhabitants of feudal Europe

¹ See *Revue des Études Juives*, ii, pp. 175, *seq.*

JEWS AND COMMERCE

never made use of money throughout their lives, being fixed on their fields and earning their living by service to their lords. With them the Jews had practically nothing to do. It was only in the towns that their presence was at all effective in helping to prepare the way for the industrial development of Europe.

CHAPTER VII

JEWES AND CAPITALISM

WE have seen that Jews helped considerably in the transition of Europe from a barter-economy to a money-economy during the quarter of a millennium (1100-1350). By the later date their functions in this regard had been transferred to Italian bankers, and they themselves, to a large extent, removed from the countries of Western Europe, except Spain. Forty years later, during the terrible persecutions of 1391, promoted by the fanaticism of St. Vincent Ferrer, the majority of the Jews of the Iberian Peninsula became forcibly converted to Christianity, but yet retained their adhesion to their ancestral faith secretly, mostly marrying among themselves, and were marked out as "new Christians" or, in popular parlance, Marranos.

For reasons not quite clear, the Jews of Spain had preserved their monopoly of money-lending, up to the fateful date 1391, without any interference from the "papal usurers," as in the west of

Western Europe. Consequently, when nominally converted, they continued to conduct the financial operations of the Spanish kings and nobles during the last struggle with the Moors, and, as is well known, in this way came to finance the voyages of Columbus. When the more faithful part of the Jewish "nation" was expelled from Spain in the same year as the discovery of America, 1492, they still retained their relations, family, friendly, and financial, with the Marranos, or "new Christians," left behind; and this enabled them, somewhat later on, to take a prominent part in the transference of the commercial hegemony from Spain to the Netherlands and England. But they were only enabled to do this by developments in European economics, which led from a money-economy to a credit-economy, which is at present the ultimate stage of economic development. With the early stages of this transition the Jews had practically nothing to do, though they availed themselves of its facilities as soon as they settled down after the convulsion of 1492.¹

¹The three stages in Spanish Jewish finance are marked by the years 1391 (the Ferrer Riots), 1492 (the Expulsion), and 1593 (the foundation of the Amsterdam community). It was between the last two dates that Europe independently created its international credit-economy.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

As R. Ehrenberg has shown, in his admirable work, *Das Zeitalter der Fugger* (Jena, 1896), the beginnings of the modern credit system, and thus of modern capitalism, in Europe were due to the need of money payments to mercenary soldiers in the wars between Charles V and Francis I, from 1520 onward, for over thirty years. Here, for the first time in European finance,¹ large sums were lent to governments (on the security of the taxes) by individual firms, or groups of firms, the Fuggers in Augsburg financing Charles V, the Strozzi being the main backers of Francis I. Now, though both these leading capitalists enlisted the resources of many other German and Italian firms, there is no evidence of any Jewish capitalists being concerned in this first great attempt to finance modern states in their capacity as military organizations. The experience of the Hundred Years' War in France, the struggle with the Moors in Spain, and the fights of the Condottieri in Italy, had shown the necessity of such financial backing when the two great world powers, the Hapsburgs and the

¹ That is, on so large a scale. The Bardi and Prescobaldi of Florence failed on account of the loans made by them to Edward III.

JEWES AND CAPITALISM

Valois, determined to fight for the conquest of the world. Jews had nothing to do with this first stage in the development of modern capitalism.

Nor were they connected with the exchanges in which these large credit transactions were consummated. Special meeting-places for merchants for money-lending and money-changing were early established in Lucca, Genoa, Florence, Venice, and other Italian cities, as well as in Montpellier and Marseilles in France, at Barcelona (after the expulsion of the Jews from that city), and even in London, in Lombard Street. But the first real exchange building (where transactions were conducted daily and not only at fair time) has been traced to Bruges, where a special building was named after the "Bursa," the name of a Bruges family (Van der Burse), which had a purse on its coat of arms. Both name and custom were then transferred to Antwerp, where the model of all European Bourses was built in 1531. Here again there is no evidence of Jewish participation in the organization of the Antwerp Exchange, though it is possible that some of the Mendez family utilized it before Don José went to Con-

stantinople to begin his remarkable career as financier of the Turkish empire.

These Marrano families spread, in the sixteenth century, throughout the New World, and toward the end of it a number of them settled in Amsterdam and formed a financial link between the empire of Philip II and the revolted Netherlands. A little later there was a similar settlement in Hamburg, and connections of the chief Marrano families like the Caceres, Carvajal, Conegliano, Henriques, and others, are found in the seventeenth century in Mexico, Brazil, Lisbon, the Canary Islands, Amsterdam, Hamburg, and even London. This wide spread of members of the same family enabled them to facilitate commercial transactions between the different countries, and especially to operate the movements of bullion needed to settle the balance of trade. Thus, to give a single example, it was calculated that Ferdinand Carvajal brought in annually £100,000 worth of bullion to London, equal to one-twelfth of the national income at the time, and this was urged as one of the reasons for admitting the Jews into England.¹ Those were the

¹ Up to quite recently the official bullion brokers of the Bank of England were Messrs. Mocatta and Goldsmid.

days of mercantilist conceptions, when exaggerated importance was attributed to the influx of the precious metals.

Besides this trade in bullion, the Marranos were also able, by their wide dispersion, to assist in the transfer of the colonial trade of the New World in sugar and indigo. There is some evidence that the Jews introduced sugar plantation into St. Thomas, and even into Brazil; and when they were expelled from the latter, in 1654, they transferred a good deal of their activity in this regard to Barbados, Jamaica, and Martinique and San Domingo, largely increasing the sugar production in these islands. The sugar trade between the French West-Indian islands and the mother-country was concentrated at Bordeaux, where the Marrano firm of Gradis, a branch of the Mendez family, practically controlled it.¹

There is little doubt that these activities of the Marranos in the bullion and colonial trades helped in a measure to transfer the hegemony of the world's commerce from Spain and Portugal to Holland and England, from Lisbon and Antwerp to Amsterdam and London. Cromwell

¹ On the other hand, there is little evidence of any important participation of Jews in the other "colonial" product, tobacco.

made use of them for this and other purposes, and obtained valuable information from them in his war with Spain,¹ and his sense of their utility in this regard was doubtless one of the reasons for his promoting their re-entrance into English life. But there were other and more potent reasons for the transfer of trade supremacy from the Iberian nations to the Dutch and English, and it would be an exaggeration to attribute any decisive influence to the Jewish factor, which was solely due to their international connections.

On the European Continent Jewish commercial development was also due to their wandering habits and dispersed family relations. Owing to the competition of the Italians and the increasing stringency of guild regulations, Jews were mainly restricted to peddling and pawn-broking by the beginning of the sixteenth century. Money-lending on a small scale still remained with them as a monopoly, but their frequent expulsions in Mid-Europe prevented any large accumulation of capital enabling them to do business on a large scale, while the kings and rulers had given up the practice of regarding their Jews as integral, though informal, parts of their treasuries. Meanwhile,

¹ L. Wolf, *Cromwell's Jewish Intelligencers*, London, 1891.

the Wars of Religion, with their mercenary troops, had brought into existence a new class of intermediary—the commissary, or war-factor (“Kriegsfaktor”). The Jews, by their connection with the second-hand trade, were favorably situated to carry out this function, and we, accordingly, find them increasingly active in this regard, from Joselmann of Rosheim and Bassevi of Prague, in the sixteenth, to the Oppenheimers and Wertheimers of the imperial court, at the end of the seventeenth century. In the great struggle between Marlborough and Louis XIV we find Sir Solomon Medina, on the one side, and Jacob Worms, on the other, as among the chief sources of supplies for the respective armies.

In the interim German Jews had increased their capital by the purchases of loot during the Thirty Years' War, and a certain number of them had been found useful by the smaller German courts for making purchases or obtaining prompt loans. There thus arose the practice of appointing the chief Jew in a residential city as a court-Jew (“Hof-Jude”). These often combined the position of purchasing agents with that of war commissaries. It may be further conjectured that those of the German princes who were fortunate

enough to have had money at their disposal were enabled to invest it through their court-Jews to advantage, sometimes by loans to their more necessitous peers. Thus, when we find the electors of Hanover and Treves assisting Emanuel Oppenheimer to recover his father's debts from the imperial treasury, it may be conjectured that part of their own capital had been advanced through the medium of his father, Samuel Oppenheimer. We certainly know that later on Mayer Rothschild acted as an intermediary of this kind between the elector of Hesse-Cassel and the Danish treasury. In this way these "Hof-Juden" acted, in some respects, as pioneers in the field of international finance, which has grown so great of recent years.

The main series of these "Hof-Juden" were those connected with the imperial court of Vienna, who began the practice under Ferdinand II in connection with the Thirty Years' War.¹ The chief names are Moses Meisels and Jacob Bassevi of Prague, Samuel Oppenheimer of Heidelberg, Samson Wertheimer of Worms, and his son, Wolf Wertheimer. The multi-racial constitution of the Austrian empire was doubtless the cause

¹ G. Wolf, *Ferdinand II und die Juden*, Vienna, 1864.

why Jews, scattered among all the provinces of the empire, were the most suitable intermediaries in collecting money and provisions. Leffmann Behrends at the Hanoverian court, Behrend Lehmann at that of Saxony, Marx Model at Ansbach, Jost Liebmann at the court of the Great Elector, and Joseph Süss Oppenheimer at that of Würtemberg are other representative names. The last-named was, for a time, the ruling influence in Würtemberg affairs, but suffered a tragic fate in 1716. But almost every small German court had its "Hof-Jude" up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, though the financial reforms of Frederick the Great rendered their aid less important in the latter half of the eighteenth century.

It is more difficult to determine the share of Jews in the initial stages of joint-stock trading. In a measure this has always existed in the shipping industry, where the capital for distant voyages was rarely supplied by the captain alone. But the historians of commerce trace the beginnings of real joint-stock trading, in which the shares had a face value endorsed to bearer and could be dealt with as negotiable property, to the formation of the Dutch East India Company, in

the very first issues of which Jews had a share, though a very moderate one.¹ They had nothing to do with the English East India Company, which followed four years later, nor with the Plymouth and London Companies, which started the colonization of North America.

So, too, it is impossible to trace any Jewish influence on the origin of the stock exchanges of Europe or the world. As soon as the Antwerp exchange was firmly established in the beginning of the sixteenth century, dealings began to be made in "futures" in the price of pepper, as well as in instruments of credit. There is no evidence of any Jewish initiative in these transactions, though possibly some Marranos may have indulged in them. The Royal Exchange of London was established by Sir Thomas Gresham in imitation of the Antwerp exchange, with which he was familiar, in 1572, when there were practically no Jews in London. It was not till more than a century later that twelve Jewish brokers were allowed to conduct business there (mainly in bullion broking) in combination with one hundred native brokers and twelve others, "foreign-

¹ For details of their participation, see Excursus on Sombart, *infra*, pp. 247, *seq.*

JEWS AND CAPITALISM

ers." In Amsterdam their participation in the exchange, both for produce and stocks, seems to have been greater, and the first full account of any European stock exchange was made by a Spanish Jew, Joseph de La Vega. Much exaggeration has been indulged in with regard to the participation of Jews even in contemporary exchanges, their number in the London Stock Exchange, at the present day, only amounting to 5 per cent, and in New York to 15 per cent, proportions by no means predominant or out of scale with the commercial significance of the Jewish contingent in these cities. It should, besides, be added that most of the Jewish members of the stock exchange center their dealings on foreign stock, where, again, their international connections give them an advantage.

It has been alleged by Prof. Sombart that Jews broke down the old system of customary prices, and introduced the modern system of competition. There is nothing to justify so broad a statement, though, of course, the peddling and second-hand trading of the Jews (as of others) interfered somewhat with the prices fixed by the guilds, till quite a late period in continental trade. Schmoller, in his classical treatment of the sub-

ject, attributes very little importance to the pedlar;¹ and it is, of course, the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth century, with its consequent increase of factory towns and wholesale trading in general, which is the true cause of the competitive methods of modern trade.

Nor can the Jews claim any special influence on modern economic development through their comparatively large connection in the great fairs of Mid-Europe, especially that held at Leipzig. Between the years 1675 and 1839 the average number of Jews who invaded the Leipzig fairs rose from 416 in 1675 to 6,444 in 1839; and in the early years of the nineteenth century they are reckoned to have formed over a quarter, and sometimes a third, of the total visitors. Here again their wide dispersion accounts for their large activity. It was convenient for them to meet customers from all the localities with which they had business relations, and the central position of Leipzig enabled Jews from Amsterdam, Nizhni-Novgorod and Frankfort, from Dessau and Vienna, from Cracow and Hamburg, to meet thrice a year and arrange their affairs. This must have helped to increase foreign trade, and especially

¹ *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kleingewerbe*, pp. 237-46.

inter-urban trade; but Jews were not the only merchants who did this, nor did they begin the practice, as was sufficiently shown by the fairs of Champagne in the Middle Ages, in which they had little or no share.¹

The wandering habits of Jews also led to an extensive development of their commercial activities, which may have helped to organize and develop general trade. In England, for example, it was customary for the Jews of the sea-port towns (who are frequently referred to in Captain Marryatt's novels) to send out their sons every Monday morning to neighboring villages as hawkers, who would return in time for the Friday night meal, meanwhile helping to circulate goods and bring back second-hand products. So, too, in Vienna, Jewish firms used to send out agents into the Bohemian and other villages to purchase wool, which was then made up in central factories. The same practice was at the root of Jewish commerce in Russia, where these itinerant agents were known as "Woher." Jewish traders

¹ The visits of Jews at the Leipzig fairs have been enumerated in two monographs by Markgraf, 1894, and Freudenthal, 1902. The former refers to the period 1664-1839, the latter goes into more detail for 1675-99.

thus collected furs throughout East Europe, and to this day the fur trade is largely in their hands.

It is, however, probable that it was through their transactions at these fairs that the Jews acquired sufficient capital to play the rôle of "Hof-Juden" and commissaries at the end of the seventeenth and throughout the eighteenth century. The incessant European wars of that period called for a much larger outlay than could be afforded by the usual taxation. Resort had to be had to loans and funded debts, and in Central Europe, at least, there were few large capitalists ready to advance loans of this kind. As Ehrenberg has shown, the practice of financing war loans began in the era of the Fuggers, in the conflict between Charles V and Francis I. But the result was the bankruptcy of the Fuggers, owing to the failure of Philip II, in 1575, and the failure of the Strozzi, who were the chief financiers of the French monarchy. These precedents would be enough to discourage any financiers who had survived the horrors of the Thirty Years' War. But, in addition to this, there was the doubtful question whether money lent to a monarch became a debt to the state after his death; absolute monarchy has its financial disadvantages.

With respect to the Jews, the case was somewhat different. Here the German kings and princes could offer privileges (of residence, of freedom of movement, and the like) which could not be well measured in money, but which were an inducement to Jews to lend their capital on much more reasonable terms than their Christian competitors, who had all these privileges without paying for them. The favored position of the "Hof-Juden," at the different German courts, enabled them, as has been suggested above, to invest the capital of the more economical princes with those who were vying with Louis XIV in the splendor of their courts or the extent of their armed conflicts. Further, for commissary purposes during the war, Jews were the only persons who would be likely to find Jewish friends in the enemy's country through whom they could deliver and obtain supplies. Recent researches have shown that, for over half a century, Jewish capital kept the Austrian treasury going. Throughout the wars with the Turks and those of the Spanish Succession and up to the first Silesian War, the extraordinary expenses of the Viennese court were obtained from a succession of Jewish financiers, beginning with Samuel Oppen-

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

heimer and including the families of Wertheimer, Sinzheim, Lehmann, and D'Aguilar, the latter a link with the Sephardic families of Amsterdam and London. These Jews supplied nearly eighty million gulden between the years 1698 to 1739, or an average of two million a year, whereas the total income of the treasury was not more than six millions.¹ Their transactions extended through Austria, the west and south of Germany, Hungary, Transylvania, and Serbia, and even to Switzerland and Italy. They got powder from Holland, Poland, and Russia; saltpetre from Bohemia, Silesia, and Hungary; weapons from Styria and Carinthia; linen from Holland; wool from Bohemia; horses and rafts from Salzburg and Bavaria; corn from Bamberg, Mayence, and Treves; wine from the Rhine and Moselle; brandy from Moravia. Here again it was the dispersion of the Jews which enabled them to conduct such extensive operations, and their connection with the Leipzig fairs doubtless assisted them in this wide net-work of transactions.

¹ See the admirable monograph of M. Grunwald, *Samuel Oppenheimer und sein Kreis*, Leipzig, 1913, which gives, in an elaborate table opposite page 160, the advances made year by year by the various Jewish firms.

JEWS AND CAPITALISM

It should perhaps be mentioned that, after 1740, the center of Jewish finance was transferred from Vienna to London, as was indicated by the migration of Moses D'Aguilar to the latter city. Here a number of Amsterdam Jews had come over with William III, and helped to transfer the bullion trade in particular from Amsterdam to London. In 1745 Sampson Gideon, their chief representative, helped the British Government by his firm attitude during the advance of the Young Pretender, as he had previously done during the South Sea Bubble, in which, be it recorded, Jews had nothing to do, nor with Law of the Mississippi Scheme. As a reward, the Government brought in the Jew bill of 1753, giving the English Jews rights of naturalization, but this had to be withdrawn during the following year owing to the clamor of the populace. A large number of the Sephardic families of London became converted in despair, but their connection with the Royal Exchange still continued, and the brothers Goldsmid became the leading bullion brokers and private bankers of London till the end of the century.

It should be here remarked that the advances by Jewish merchants to European monarchs or

governments in the eighteenth century were of quite a different character to the tallages and aids given by the mediæval Jews to the royal treasuries of England, France, or Spain. These were actual payments made for the privilege of existence in these countries, and no one expected them to be repaid to the unfortunate Jew. But the advances made by Oppenheimer and his circle to the Austrian treasury were distinctly recognized as loans, and were more or less repaid from time to time. By their inter-relations the Jews of Mid-Europe formed a connected banking association, issuing loans to the various monarchs and occasionally, as we have seen, transferring monies from one to the other. By their intra-national operations they prepared the way for the international finance of the nineteenth century, in which they were, in large measure, pioneers.

Schmoller has shown, in one of the most masterly of his essays, that, in the money-economy of European nations, finance goes through three stages: (1) local, where towns try to keep all trade to themselves and treat other towns as "foreign"; (2) territorial, where this close corporation is extended to a number of towns; and, finally, (3) national, in which customs and ex-

cise and other financial operations are conducted in the service of the whole state, chiefly for purposes of war.¹ Jews had little or nothing to do with the first two of these stages, and, with regard to the third, they are chiefly connected with the war loans and commissariat of the wars of Louis XIV. But there is a further stage not recognized, or at least not emphasized by Schmoller, in which finance becomes international, and here Jews became an influential factor, partly owing to the continued monopoly of bullion broking by the Marrano families, but chiefly because of the financial genius of Nathan Rothschild.

His father, Mayer Amschel Rothschild, a money-changer and bric-à-brac dealer in Frankfort, became the Hof-Jude of the landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, then possessed of the largest private fortune in Europe, derived mainly from the hire of Hessians to quell the American Revolution. Rothschild had helped the landgrave to invest this money in Frankfort city loans and in the Danish state debt. Meanwhile his son Nathan, after a successful career as manufacturer of Manchester goods for seven years, had settled in

¹ G. Schmoller, *The Mercantile System*, in W. J. Ashley's *Economic Classics* (New York, 1894).

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

London in 1805, and married a sister-in-law of Sir Moses Montefiore, and thus became connected with the Sephardic bullion-brokers of London. When therefore the grand duke of Hesse-Cassel had to flee from his duchy after Jena, it was natural that his agent should transmit the "running cash" of the landgrave to his son Nathan at London, who immediately utilized it by buying bullion for Lord Wellesley, about to begin his Peninsular campaign. The deaths of Abraham Goldsmid and Sir Francis Baring, in 1810, left Nathan Rothschild undisputed master of the bullion market in London, and all the payments made to the Continent by England during the struggle with Napoleon—reckoned to amount to £15,000,000 from 1808 to 1814—were made through him. After his father's death, in 1812, he arranged for the establishment of branches of the firm in Paris, Vienna, and Naples, and from 1818 onward the five brothers were the chief medium through which the governments of Europe issued their loans for the next thirty years, during which they amounted to nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars.¹

¹ Ehrenberg suggests that they obtained the capital for these loans by the profits in bullion broking before Waterloo, and in

The example of the Rothschilds in thus establishing brothers in different European capitals was followed by other Jewish families like the Sterns, Speyers, Lazards, Oppenheims, Warburgs, and Seligmans. These sometimes joined in, but at other times competed with the Rothschilds in issuing numerous loans for industrial purposes in Europe during the period 1818-48. After the latter date the practice of issuing loans through favored firms was mostly given up, and the subscriptions were thrown open to the general public. At the same time the joint-stock principle was introduced into banks, and institutions like the Credit Mobilier, the Dresdener Bank, and the Deutsche Bank were founded mostly by combinations of Jewish firms, which considerably reduced the predominance of the Rothschilds in the financial world but increased the general influence of Jews in international finance.

It would, however, be a mistake to regard all these Jewish firms as acting together. Heine refers to Rothschild and Fuld as "Two rabbis of finance, who were as much opposed to one another

the four years, 1815-18, by "bearing" operations against the loans issued by Ouvrard and Baring on behalf of the French and British Governments, who were therefore obliged to admit the Rothschilds into the loan-issuing "ring" from 1818 onwards.

as Hillel and Shammai"; and in much later days the opposition of the firms of Montagu and Rothschild was equally marked in London. The Sterns obtained the Portuguese loans in opposition to the Rothschilds, and the Pereires were successful against them in getting the concession for the South Russian railways. Yet in France the predominance of the Rothschilds was so marked that as early as 1848 it was reckoned that the Paris house was worth six hundred million francs, as against three hundred and sixty-two millions possessed by the rest of the Parisian bankers. In 1876 an attempt to check this predominance was started by a number of Catholic families, who founded the Union Générale, which, however, failed disastrously in 1885, causing the ruin of many noble French families and being the secret origin of the anti-Semitism which broke out immediately afterwards.¹ The failure of the Barings in 1893 brought to an end the rivalry of seventy years between "Jew Rothschild and his fellow-Christian Baring," referred to by Byron in his *Don Juan* (xii, 5); but here the Rothschilds intervened, and prevented the utter ruin of their rivals. As a consequence, the firm was left pre-

¹ The struggle is graphically described by Zola in his *L'Argent*.

dominant in the financial world in London and the British empire.

It would, however, be misleading to regard the Jewish element in international finance as increasing in importance during the nineteenth century; on the contrary, it probably reached its maximum in 1848, when the third French Revolution reduced the importance of Baron James de Rothschild (the Baron Nucingen of Balzac), and at the same time introduced the principle of public subscription for state loans. Since that time other firms, English, French, and German, not of the Jewish race, have adopted the principle of establishing branches in the different capitals of Europe as well as in the United States, while the largest accumulations of capital had been made during that period, not by banking but by industrial operations. The great capitalists of the world are armament-makers like the Krupps and Armstrongs, the iron masters like Carnegie and Whitworth, the Standard Oil magnates like Rockefeller, Frick, and Flagler, the railway magnates like the Vanderbilts, the Goulds, and the like. It is only quite recently that a few German Jews have become prominent in the industrial world, like the Mondes in the chemical industries, Ballin

in ship-building, Rathenau in the electrical industries, and Friedlander-Fuld in coal.

Jewish finance had, however, a certain influence on the beginnings of railways in continental Europe. The Rothschilds financed the great Northern Railway of France and the Nordbahn of Austria, the Bischoffheims the railway system of Belgium, the Pereires the Southern Railways of Russia, with which the Poliakoffs and Brodskys were also connected. Baron de Hirsch founded his great fortune by establishing the railway system of the Balkans, and the Bleichroeders had much to do with the Prussian railway system before it was taken over by the Government. In America the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. have done much toward combining the interests of the various railway systems, and were, for a time, the bankers of the Harriman lines, extending over fifty thousand miles, and amounting to twelve billion dollars. But the last-named firm has recently withdrawn from its railway connections, and the participation of the others is now in the past, often in the long past. Jewish finance appears to run more particularly into the pioneer trades, where profits are at first more promising.

This may account for their relative importance

in the early stages of the British colonial empire, though it would be entirely misleading to attribute to them any predominant influence; the relative smallness of their numbers would have been enough to prevent this. In South Australia the firm of Montefiore was an influential element in the early years of the colony, and in New Zealand Sir Julius Vogel gave a great impulse by his bold policy of attracting British capital to the development of the colony. In South Africa the Mosenthals were the chief factors in developing the wool and hide trades, and originated the mohair industry, which now controls half the world's output; and the brothers De Pass were for many years the largest ship-owners in Cape Town. In Natal, Nathaniel Isaacs was appointed, in 1828, "principal chief," with sole rights of traffic with the Zulus, by Tchaka, the so-called Napoleon of South Africa. In the Transvaal, Samuel Marks, Barnett Barnato, and the firm of Wernher, Beit & Co., have been large factors in the development of the diamond industry. In Canada, the Joseph family were prominent in the early development of the Canadian railway system.

With regard to the West-Indian colonies, ref-

erence has already been made to the large participation of Jews in the sugar trade, their chief output. They practically monopolized the Jamaica trade in sugar, rum, and molasses in the middle of the eighteenth century. At that time a number of Jews who had settled in Newport, R. I., where the tolerant principles of Roger Williams still ruled, did extensive business with the West-Indian islands. Aaron Lopez owned at one time as many as thirty vessels. Jacob Rivera introduced there the manufacture of spermacetti. So, too, Abraham de Lyon introduced viticulture into Georgia, where also Dr. Nunes largely developed the growth of indigo. In California, Jewish firms had much to do with the early development of the country, and especially with the connection of that state with Alaska and its seal fisheries, which have been largely developed by Jewish firms. These are almost the sole examples of pioneer influence of Jews in American commerce, and would form but an infinitesimal fraction of its whole vast extension. In more recent developments, however, Jews play some considerable part in copper mining and smelting (the firms of Guggenheim and Lewisohn), in the peculiarly American establish-

ments known as department stores, and in the clothing industries, which they practically monopolize.¹

To sum up, the influence of Jews on the vast extension of modern commerce has been mainly due to their international connections, which enable them to transfer goods and bullion from one country to another with the least risk. The scattering of the Marranos throughout the Spanish empire, just when the large production of the precious metals in America gave an enormous impetus to European commerce, tended to throw the bullion trade into their hands; this was the more important, as from 1600 to 1750 the whole financial policy of Europe was ruled by the mercantile system, based on the desirability of retaining as much gold as possible within the country. In Mid-Europe the restriction of Jewish activity to money-lending, pawn-broking, and the second-hand trade generally threw into their hands much of the loot of the numerous wars of the seventeenth century, and caused them to be

¹ See J. E. Pope, *The Clothing Industry in New York*, Columbia, Mo., 1905. It was necessary to go into some detail on Jewish commercial activities in the United States owing to the exaggerations indulged in with regard to this by Sombart. (See *infra*, p. 247, *seq.*)

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

utilized as commissaries and court factors by the various German princes. By this means they had some influence on the general development of national finance in the German principalities, as opposed to the territorial and local stages which preceded their participation. Their wide dispersion led to their comparatively large share in the Leipzig and other fairs, which may have helped toward the stabilizing of European prices. The wandering habits thus induced were a preparation for the relatively large share of Jews in the early stages of colonial expansion; but here, as elsewhere, the Jews shared in modern movements and did not monopolize them.

CHAPTER VII *a*

EXCURSUS ON SOMBART

THE preceding account of Jewish influence on modern capitalism would have to be much enlarged if one could trust the analysis of it made by Prof. Werner Sombart in his *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben*.¹ According to him, all the predominant features which distinguish modern capitalism from mediæval trade and industry are directly due to Jewish influence. Thus, the economic form of the modern state was due to the activities of the Jews as purveyors and financiers, in providing the state with capital for war and development (I, v). They helped considerably in the foundation of modern colonies, which has determined the policy and controlled the development of modern states (I, iv), and quickened international trade by the large scale

¹ Leipzig, 1911. Translation by M. Epstein, 1913, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

of their trade, the variety of their wares, and the introduction of new commodities (I, iii). As a consequence, we find the centers of trade changing from one country or center to another, according as Jews were expelled or found shelter; Sombart gives as examples the transference of trade from Spain to Holland, from Antwerp to Amsterdam, from Augsburg to Frankfort and Hamburg (I, ii). Above all, Jews have transformed economic life in commercializing it by creating credit instruments and introducing the custom of buying and selling securities, which supplied mobile capital for industrial undertakings (I, v); they thereby introduced their capitalistic point of view into modern trade, with its competitive (against "just") prices, its advertisements, adulterations, payment by instalments, utilization of waste products, and general efficiency (I, vii).

This would indeed be a formidable debt owed to Jewish influence by the modern world, if the whole foundation of its economic life had been determined or even largely influenced by Jews. But it is to be feared that they cannot lay such a flattering unction to their souls (if Prof. Sombart will grant that they have souls). In

the first place it is curious to find the author of a standard work on modern capitalism so misleading or misled as to its true characteristics. As Mr. J. A. Hobson points out in his *Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, 1894, the essence of this is the employment, by persons with money capital, of hired men, generally known as "hands," for production on a large scale by means of machines; hence he terms his subject "A Study of Machine Production." The main, indeed exclusive, motive of the capitalist, or "undertaker," is to obtain profits ("Unternehmergewinn," the Germans call it); and hence he is called by his Socialist opponents a "profiteer." The method by which this profit is determined is by the relations of supply and demand in an open market accessible to all capitalists under the stress of unrestricted competition. Here comes in the contrast with mediæval conditions, in which prices, and therefore profits, were regulated and made customary by the state or local authorities on the Canon Law principle of a "just price," and competition was restricted or rather removed by the veto on usury or money-lending and by the regulations of guilds or close trade and mercantile corporations.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Now the cause of this transition from regulated and customary prices to competitive ones is the best known and most fundamental phenomenon in economic history. It is known as the Industrial Revolution, and began in England in the quarter of a century between 1760 and 1785, with numerous inventions in the machines of the textile industries, and the introduction of steam produced by sea-coal as a motive power. Jews had absolutely nothing to do with this, for there is not a single name of a Jewish manufacturer known in England before 1798, when Nathan Rothschild began his short career as a manufacturer of Manchester goods and, though fairly successful, gave it up, after seven years, for bullion broking upon settling in London in 1805. The Jews did not even begin to settle in Birmingham, Liverpool, or Manchester until about 1780, and then as pedlars and pawn-brokers. Throughout the eighteenth century the Jews of England did not number one-tenth of 1 per cent of the population, and nineteen-twentieths of them were concentrated in London, which was never predominantly a manufacturing town. The Jews were either business men, bullion brokers, pedlars, or pawn-brokers.

Nor is there any evidence of any activity of Jews in the spread of industrialism or capitalism from England to the Continent or to America. No Jewish name occurs among the manufacturers who attempted to carry out Napoleon's protectionist schemes in France or even in the Confederation of the Rhine.¹ Even Prof. Sombart, who gives an entirely imaginary picture of Jewish participation among the early American pioneers,² does not contend that Jews were at all actively engaged in American manufacture in its early stages.³ There were probably not over two thousand Jews in the whole of the United States by 1800, out of a population of five millions, and nine-tenths of these were settled in Charleston, New York, Philadelphia, and Lancaster. In attempting to make out that this hand-

¹ Schmoller, however, declares that the Berlin silk manufactories had French and Jewish factors, and that afterwards they were developed by Jewish manufacturers, the Mendelssohns, Friedlanders, Veits, and Marcuses (*loc. cit.*, p. 89).

² *Loc. cit.*

³ Their participation in the sugar industry was not really of a capitalistic nature, since it was entirely based upon slave labor. Socialists may term the modern "hand" a slave, but he can at least change his employer or go on strike and thus employ the weapon of competition, characteristic of the capitalistic system.

ful of merchants had the lion's share in the economic development of England or America, Prof. Sombart is emulating Lord Dundreary in attempting to make the tail, or, one would say, rather, the tip of the tail, wag the lion.

The truth of the matter is, Prof. Sombart, in overriding his hobby, has vastly exaggerated the part played by Jews in modern economic development. That part, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, consisted in promoting international trade and supplying, in a relatively large measure, the bullion that balanced it. Now, in the eighteenth century, in England, external commerce was by no means a predominant part of the whole English output. Macpherson, in his *Annals of Commerce*, reckoned the export trade to be about one in thirty-two of the whole output, and even at the present day it is not more than a fifth. In the middle of the eighteenth century the total exports of England were about £15,000,000, and the total income of the Jewish community of London was estimated at half a million, implying at that time a turnover of two millions. The commercial classes at that time were estimated by Arthur Young to constitute seven hundred thousand souls out of a

total population of eight million and a half. If these figures were at all accurate, the Jews of England, while they may have controlled one-eighth of the foreign commerce, only manipulated half of 1 per cent of the total business of the country, which was, at that time, establishing the capitalistic system destined to rule the world. When put into figures, Prof. Sombart's visionary estimates tend rather to disappear.

A remarkable instance of this has been given by H. Waetjen in his study of Sombart's statements about Jewish participation in modern colonization.¹ Sombart had asserted that the Jews had much to do with the founding of the Dutch East India Company in 1602, which, we have seen, was practically the beginning of the modern joint-stock method of trading. Waetjen has ascertained, from an examination of the books of the company, that of the first subscription of six and a half millions of florins the Jewish contribution consisted of 4,800 florins, or less than a tenth of 1 per cent. He also shows that Sombart is entirely mistaken in stating that the first governor of Java was a Jew, and indeed

¹ H. Waetjen, *Das Judentum und die Anfaenge der modern Kolonisation*, Berlin, 1914.

shows that no Jew was allowed to become a higher official of the company, and not even a director of it. As regards the English East India Company, Jews were excluded from all the "regulated companies."¹ Similarly with regard to the Dutch West India Company, founded in 1621, which was, to some degree, helped by the Brazilian Jews; but the total contribution of the eighteen Amsterdam Jews, who subscribed to its seven million capital in 1623, was only thirty-six thousand florins, about half of 1 per cent. Here again we find gross exaggeration on the part of Prof. Sombart.

As regards the claim that the economic form of the modern state is due to Jewish finance and army-purveying (Sombart, I, v), we have seen above that this began, without any participation by Jews, in the era of the Fuggers, at the beginning of modern history, when France attempted to put forth claims to territorial aggrandizement in Italy and began the century-long conflict between the Bourbons and the Hapsburgs. Similarly, their participation in modern colonization (I, iv) had been reduced to its

¹ Cunningham, *Growth of English Trade*, Cambridge, 1892, vol. ii, p. 283.

proper proportions in the preceding chapter, and the introduction of new wares and international trade, on which Sombart lays so much stress (I, iii), has been roughly noted above, and is far from significant when one recalls the long tariff lists of modern international trade.

There is the same want of historical foundation with regard to Sombart's claim that the Jews invented the chief instruments of credit and began the practice of buying and selling them (I, vi). He himself owns that he has no definite proof of the Jewish origin of the Bill of Exchange, and his seemingly striking connection of the Polish Jewish form of that document known as the "Mamran," with similar talmudic instruments, has been shown by Steckelmacher¹ to be erroneous, and that the very name, instead of being Hebrew, is simply a corruption of "membrana," while the words of the instrument itself speak of its conferring "the same rights as the bills of exchange which are usual in the royal courts." As regards the rise of the Bourses with speculation in "futures"² and trading in instru-

¹ M. Steckelmacher, *Randbemerkungen zu Werner Sombart*, Berlin, 1912, p. 8.

² They were frankly called "Apuestas," or wagers, on the Antwerp Bourse. See Ehrenberg, *op. cit.*, i, p. 81.

ments of credit, we have seen that all this arose in Antwerp and London before Jews existed there. Sombart further confuses the Royal Exchange of London, founded in 1572, with its Stock Exchange, which only came into existence in 1780. The twelve Jewish brokers allowed on the former were mainly bullion brokers. As Jews did such little trade in manufactures, it is highly improbable that advertisements began with them, and Sombart only quotes a casual instance. The utilization of waste products is again a by-product of manufacture on a large scale, with the initial stages of which Jews had nothing to do. As hawkers or dealers they may have introduced the practice of payment by instalments, but Sombart gives no reliable evidence of this, and it is to be remembered that Jews were not the only pedlars on the beach.

Finally, as regards Sombart's curious contention that the presence of Jews was the cause of the transference of trade hegemony from one town or country to another, this is surely a case of inverting the position of the cart and the horse. The Jews followed the trade, and not the trade the Jews. They naturally resorted to any open markets where their transactions would

not be hampered by the price restrictions of the guilds which they were not allowed to join. Other and much more profound reasons can be given for the transference of the Venetian trade supremacy to Spain and Portugal, and thence to Holland and England.¹ How would Prof. Sombart explain the rise and fall of the Hanseatic League by his Jewish hobby, when, for the most part, there were no Jews at all in the Hanse towns? The small part taken by the Jewish Marranos in transferring trade supremacy from the Iberian Peninsula to the Netherlands is the only germ of truth in this part of his position.

When a professor of economics is so lax about his economic facts and history, it would be idle to expect him to be more profound in his incursions into the much more complex problems of Jewish theology and racial psychology. Yet the historical part of Prof. Sombart's work, which fills the first one hundred and fifty pages of his book (in the English edition), is followed by another couple of hundred pages, tracing this alleged connection between Jews and modern

¹ See Roscher, *Handel und Gewerbe*, third edition, 1882, pp. 82-7.

capitalism to even more imaginary characteristics of the Jewish race and even of the Jewish religion.

According to Sombart, Jews were particularly adapted for their rôle as founders of modern capitalism owing to their dispersion and position as alien semi-citizens having great wealth (II, x). Even the religion of the Jew determined his capacity for economic life, being rationalistic, legalistic, and non-mystical. The conception of sin in Judaism, according to Sombart, is quite commercial in character, the sole motive for holiness being the reward in the world to come. The rational aspect of Jewish life also led to its commercialization owing to the self-control preached by it (II, xi); even the isolation of Israel has helped commercially by removing all sentiment from business with "strangers," and making the Jews the apostles of *Laissez-faire*. Sombart notices the remarkable resemblance of Jews and Puritans in this regard,¹ and yet contends that there is something racial

¹He owns indebtedness in this regard to the book of Max Weber on "Puritanism and Capitalism," which led to his applying the same arguments to Jews. But, if so, how can there be any racial element in the connection?

in the tendency of Jews toward commerce because of their intellectuality, energy, and adaptability (II, xii). Prof. Sombart decides that the Jews were not originally a commercial people, but have, throughout the ages, been money-lenders; even the Talmud shows a remarkable knowledge of money transactions (III, xiii); and all this, according to him, bears a trace of the original desert origin of the Jewish race, which is comparatively pure. This desert origin is the key to their nomadic tendencies, and even accounts for their predilection for city life, since modern cities are great deserts! (III, xiv).

This farrago of fantasies about Jewish life and religion scarcely deserves serious consideration, especially as we have seen that it is put forward to explain a series of facts which are either non-existent or grossly exaggerated. As regards the "new" view¹ that Jewish aptitude for finance is due to the fact that they were, from the inception of their national life, money-lenders, it is sufficient to point out that, during the first thousand years of Israelite national existence, there was no coined money. Before the period of the Maccabæans the basis of the national life

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 301.

was a self-contained agricultural economy which needed no money. Again the alleged desert origin of Jewish characteristics is merely a belated echo of Renan, and is based upon an utter misunderstanding of the ethnological connections of the Jewish race. While they adopted a Semitic language on settling in Canaan, their racial affinities were much closer with the broad-headed and mountainous Armenians, whom they resemble in face and expression even at the present day.¹ As regards the absence of mysticism from Jewish religion, this is due merely to absence of knowledge on Prof. Sombart's part. There is a mystical strain in Judaism from the time of Ezekiel and the apocalyptic books up to the appearance of the Kabbalah, which, we have seen above, was the main source of Christian mysticism at the time of the Renaissance. It was a Jewish philosopher who put forth the mystical and supremely independent view that we should love God even though He did not love us in return.²

¹ It is remarkable in this connection that Hebrew tradition traces their ultimate origin to mount Ararat.

² Spinoza, *Ethics*, V. Goethe was particularly struck by this conception (*Dichtung und Wahrheit*), and utilized it in his *Egmont*.

Prof. Sombart refers to the Talmud as showing the legalistic and the commercial spirit of the Jewish religion; one might just as well make the same assertion about Christianity on the strength of Justinian's *Corpus Juris*, which is, after all, a Christian document. As in the one case reference would naturally be had to the "Book of Common Prayer," "The Imitation of Christ," and other devotional manuals, so Prof. Sombart might have obtained a more adequate idea of Jewish devotion by reading, in accessible translation, the Jewish Prayer Book, not to mention the Book of Psalms, which has given a mode of approach to the Divine, both for Jew and Christian. There is a special class of Jewish works which brings out the purely ethical character of the Jewish religion in a striking manner. Men are most earnest at the point of death; and it became a practice for pious Jews to give ethical advice to their children in what is known as ethical wills. Prof. Sombrat would find some difficulty in supporting his superficial views from these productions.¹ Now as

¹ On these see the interesting essay by Israel Abrahams, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, iii, pp. 436, *seq.*

regards the contention that the Jewish religion regards good works as only the means of obtaining celestial profits, it is to be observed that this is a natural and human aspect of all the religions of civilization. Everybody knows how it is emphasized in Islam, and yet Muhammedans have not shown any particular genius for commerce or finance. But in Christianity itself the whole doctrine of Justification by Works is based upon the same conception, and what is Dante's *Divina Commedia* but a sublime and continuous exemplification of the connection of sublunary goodness and badness with supernal rewards and punishments? Fifty years ago one of the favorite evangelical volumes of sermons was Binney's *How to Make the Best of Both Worlds*; and nothing could be more commercial than its title and tone. Prof. Sombart himself has observed the resemblance between the Puritans and Jews with regard to the combination of piety with business, and one might add the example of the Quakers, in whom it was equally conspicuous. Even the Jesuits proved themselves as much successes as men of business as they ultimately

proved failures in winning back the world to their Church.¹

Sombart even drags in the memoirs of Glückel of Hameln to prove the commercial aspects of Jewish piety, because she is always praying for rich husbands for her daughters. If this were conclusive, the whole of the French nobility with their *mariages de convenance* would be convicted of the same commercialism. Poor Glückel! If ever a womanly soul gave signs of the most trustful piety, showing the greatest confidence in the designs of her Heavenly Father, it was surely Glückel. That she was a good business woman as well as a deeply pious soul is only another instance of this curious combination which is found quite as widely spread among Christians as among Jews. We might easily parallel Glückel of Hameln by Thackeray's picture of old Mrs. Newcome, the head of the banking-house and the support of evangelical missions and charities.

It is curious that Sombart should have made these fundamental errors in explaining even the small amount of justification for connecting Jews

¹ Where the fundamental arguments are so egregiously unjustified by facts, it is obviously unnecessary to refute details, which has been effectively done by Steckelmacher, *op. cit.*, and M. Hoffmann, *Judentum und Kapitalismus*, Berlin, 1912.

with modern capitalism, since he has given the real reasons—their being dispersed over a wide area as aliens and semi-citizens (II, x). It is for him to explain further how, if their existence as aliens conduced to their commercial and financial capacity, their position as semi-citizens also helped toward that end. But we have seen that it was the international dispersion of the Marranos and, to some extent, of the German Jews which enabled them to perform their intermediary functions; and it was religious persecution, and not their desert origin, which caused both their dispersion and their quasi-alien status. In the same chapter Sombart gives, as a further reason, the wealth of the Jews, which is a necessary basis for his contention, but has failed to consider the fact that this wealth was only found in a few hands even among Jews who, taken as a whole, are the poorest people having European civilization. That is a little problem which may be left for Prof. Sombart to work into his wild theories. One may also ask him to explain how it has come about that, wherever the hand of oppression has been removed and the open career has been afforded, Jews, with their alleged commercial instincts, have become less and less addicted to

commercial pursuits. The proportion of professional men, and indeed of artisans, has notably increased among them during the past century.

Thus Prof. Sombart fails to prove either side of his double thesis, the Jewish foundation of capitalism or the capitalistic foundation of Judaism. His failure is not surprising, considering that, notwithstanding his industry, he shows such want of real insight into Jewish life or thought. But it is even more remarkable that he makes such blunders in the basic facts of economic history in which he ought to be an expert. He has evidently been obsessed with the idea that the slogan, "business is business," rules both Jewish life and religion, and, with indefatigable patience, has sought for every fact, however minute or misleading, which could carry out his exaggerated views.¹

Perhaps the most striking example of Sombart's exaggerations is shown in his attempt to prove that "what we call Americanism is nothing else than the Jewish spirit distilled" (p. 44). To substantiate this startling statement he points

¹ His historical exaggerations have been pointed out by Below in *Hist. Zeits.*, cviii, 614, *seq.*, as well as F. Rachfahl in *Preuss. Jahrb.*, cxlvii, i, 13, *seq.*

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

out a few isolated facts, as that in 1785 Abraham Mordecai settled in Alabama, and that in 1661 Asser Levi became the owner of some real estate in Albany. Chicago, according to Prof. Sombart, is fundamentally Jewish because the first brick house there was built by Benedict Schubert, and Philip Newburg introduced the tobacco business there. He gives (p. 44) an elaborate picture of the pioneers of America going forth to conquer the wilderness in batches of twenty families, the twentieth of which started the country store, on which the rest depended for their supplies, and suggests that in most cases this twentieth family was Jewish. Now it is quite true that the country store was the germ of American business development, and that all the great business leaders like Levi Morton, E. D. Morgan, H. B. Claflin, Marshall Field, Pullman, Pillsbury, Armour, J. D. Rockefeller, and J. J. Hill received their business training in country stores; but there is absolutely no evidence of any large participation of Jews in country stores in early days, and up to 1850 there were not enough of them to go around, even if the country store occupied one in a thousand families instead of being one in twenty. As a

matter of fact, American Jews mostly remained in the coast towns of the East, and scarcely a handful joined the pioneers who settled in country villages. It is difficult to restrain one's patience when dealing with such obvious and opinionated distortions of notorious facts.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BREAK-DOWN OF THE CHURCH-EMPIRE

IN the preceding chapter and its appendix, in order to dispose at once of the more obvious and more material aspects of the subject, we have considered the influence of Jews in the economic development of Western Europe up to the present day, whereas previous chapters were confined to their intellectual and other influence up to the Renaissance. We must now retrace our steps and deal with the relations of Jews to the European developments for the three centuries between the Renaissance and the French Revolution. This period is distinguished in European history by the break-up of the Church-Empire, with the fundamental principle of orthodoxy as the basis of citizenship, which was the cause, as we have seen, of the anomalous position of the Jews in the European State system. It might therefore have been anticipated that this period would have seen an ameliora-

tion in the Jewish position and an increased share of Jews in the intellectual development of the European mind. Yet these three centuries—1492-1781—saw the lowest condition of the Jewish people, politically, socially, and intellectually, and the Jewish spirit probably reached its nadir at the Peace of Westphalia, 1648. This is the more remarkable, as the chief motive force of the period, the Reformation, may be regarded as a revival of Hebraism in European affairs, and one would have thought that Jews would have benefited by an appeal to their own Scriptures, which were never so revered as during this time; the contrary was the case.

The reasons for this were complex, and were both external and internal. The expulsions of the preceding centuries had driven the Jews from the lands of Western Europe and of rising culture and influence to those of Central and Eastern Europe, Germany, Poland, and Turkey, destined to be lands of internecine conflict and of declining culture. But there was a further internal movement in European civilization which rendered the position of the Jews still more precarious, and, in a measure, degraded, in the national Church-State, into which the me-

diæval Church-Empire broke up, than in the Empire itself. These were, for a considerable time, more theocratic than the papal Empire which had been growing more and more secularized, and, in a measure, tolerant, owing to the influence of Humanism in Italy.

The Reformation put a stop to all this, and revived, in all its acuteness, the animosities of theological controversy. Christendom was split up into an infinity of sects, and the disputes of Lutherans and Zwinglians, of Arminians and Calvinists, of Independents and Presbyterians, of Jesuits and Port-Royalists, distracted men's minds, and aroused their bitterest feelings. Shakespeare might well make Shylock say: "See how these Christians love one another." And where the fellow-Christian was so well hated the Jew could less hope to be tolerated. Well might Bossuet, in his *Histoire des Variations*, contend against Protestantism, that owing to the multiplication of sects the last state of the Church was far worse than before, provided, of course, that the underlying assumption of the whole controversy were granted, that any of the conflicting doctrines contained the only and the whole truth.

For it was equally the claim of each of the

Protestant persuasions, as of the Roman Catholic Church, that it alone held the key to man's salvation. Each of them also took over from Rome that conception of the State, which regarded it as one of its functions to safeguard the salvation of each and all of its citizens. Hence arose a Protestant theory of persecution,¹ which regarded it as part of the State's duty to see that the souls of its citizens should not be destroyed by the moral contagion of heresy, regarded as an infectious spiritual disease. The immediate result of the Reformation was to produce a number of national papacies, in which the monarch took the place of the pope, and claimed an equally divine right to safeguard the souls of his subjects. Even in republics like Geneva, Scotland, or Massachusetts, this duty to persecute was vested in the magistrate or in an oligarchic board of ministers. Jews could not hope to escape, even though all sides recognized that they held a part of the Christian truth, for it was equally the contention of all parties that the decisive criterion of salvation lay in just these divergencies from the common fund of truth. It is curious

¹ See Lord Acton's essay on the Protestant theory of persecution in his *History of Freedom and Other Essays*, London, 1909.

that the contemporary Jews had so little influence on the Reformation which, in a measure, might be described as a reversion to the pure Hebraism of the Old Testament and a renunciation of the Hellenistic elements in the Church.

On the Reformation itself Jews had directly but slight influence. Reuchlin, one of its chief forerunners, was, as we have seen, convinced that the surest foundation for the Christian truth was to be found in the Kabbalah, and therefore defended the study of the Talmud against the convert Pfefferkorn, and thus led up to the publication of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, which was practically the first skirmish in the struggle.¹ When, later on, Protestants were forced back on the literal interpretation of the Bible as their last stronghold, the question whether the vowel-points were an integral part of the text came into prominence, and the services of Elijah Levita were called in to settle the question. Indeed, throughout the whole controversy there was an uneasy suspicion that the Hebrew

¹ The best account of the *Epistolæ* in English still remains that of Sir William Hamilton, in his *Discussions*, pp. 202-38. See also the relevant chapters in L. Geiger's *Johann Reuchlin*, Leipzig, 1871.

truth was only possessed by Hebrews, and the chief Protestant scholars had resort to the instruction of rabbis to ascertain it. Throughout Western Europe a complete school of Christian Hebraists, among whom may be mentioned Hugh Broughton, John Selden, and Lightfoot in England, the Buxtorfs in Germany and Switzerland, and Surenhus in Holland, made considerable study of the Talmud and of the post-biblical literature of the Jews. The two chief Protestant translations of the Bible, the Lutheran and King James' Versions, were largely influenced by the Jewish commentators—Luther by Rashi through de Lyra's *Postillæ*, and the Authorized Version by Kimhi. In several of the controversies of the day Jewish learning was called in as arbiter; Selden's great work on tithes was based upon rabbinical sources. Protestant theologians throughout North Europe consulted Manasseh ben Israel, and even Pascal's *Pensées* are full of references to Jewish authorities. But the chief theological controversies of the age, on the authority of the Church tradition, on Justification by Faith, on Free Will, on Grace, on Original Sin, and on Transubstantiation, dealt with topics for the most part outside the sphere of Jewish in-

fluence, and so far tended to minimize the Judaic element in Christian theology.

Curiously enough the most potent influence was in the political rather than in the theological sphere, and came direct from the Bible without connection with contemporary Jews. The theocratic and republican tone of the Old Testament had a wide influence on the sectaries. The short-lived rule of the Anabaptists was based entirely upon biblical models. I have previously referred to the biblical influence on Puritan ideals of government and social life, and even upon their personal names, and it would be easy to extend the list.¹ A single concrete instance must suffice here. One of the burning questions of the age was as to the right of rebellion against kings, which seemed opposed to their divine right to passive obedience. Both Papalists and Puritans were agreed as to the divine right, though the former contended that this was "conceded" and conferred on kings by the pope. Yet the Jesuits needed some modification to excuse their opposition to Henry IV, and the Puritans to legalize, from the biblical standpoint, their taking arms against Charles I. Both sides got out of the

¹ *Supra*, chapter i.

difficulty by the theory of a double covenant, one between the Lord and the king and the people, in which God promised prosperity if He were truly worshipped; and the other between the king and the people, that he would help them in such worship; if the second covenant were broken the people were released from their compact. For proof of such a double covenant, both sides refer to Jehoiada's making these two covenants with Jehoash.¹ Incidentally it may be mentioned that the notion of popular sovereignty at the root of such covenants was made the basis of the theory of the original contract between government and people, which forms the whole basis of the theory of government according to Locke and Rousseau, which was the motive force of the English, the American, and the French Revolutions. A further instance, how biblical texts were regarded as decisive in determining political questions, may be given from John Cotton's *An Abstract of the Laws of New England as They are Now Established* (London, 1641). In dealing with the election of magistrates, he gives biblical references for each of his rules. "All magistrates are to be chosen (1)

¹ Second Kings 11, 17.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

by the free Burgesses—Deut. 1, 13; (2) out of the free Burgesses—Deut. 17, 15; (3) out of the ablest men and most approved amongst them—Ex. 18, 21; (4) out of the rank of Noblemen or Gentlemen amongst them—Eccles. 10, 17, Jer. 30, 21”; and so throughout.¹ But it is unnecessary to press this point, which is universally known, and besides has only indirect bearing upon the influence of Jews themselves, apart from their Scriptures.

One of the effects of the Reformation was to intensify the belief in witchcraft and generally in thaumaturgic practices, on which the practical Kabbalah of the Jews may possibly have had some influence; Reuchlin certainly appears to have had some belief in Jewish magic. If so, the Jews were severely punished, for it helped to intensify the popular belief that there was something uncanny about them, and led to those “vulgar errors” of the *Fætor Judaicus* and about Jews wearing tails, of which Sir Thomas Browne speaks, and the latter of which has lingered on to the present day.²

¹ See Dobschütz, *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*, New York, 1914, p. 159.

² Perhaps the most remarkable instance of this attitude was shown in the burning of Jean Allard at Paris, in 1620, for hav-

The Protestant theory of persecution, as we have seen, was based upon the conception of the theocratic state derived from Old Testament models. The extermination of the Canaanites, the executions of Agag and Haman, the extermination of the prophets of Baal, were quoted as precedents of similar severities toward the rebels against God's truth. But, in reality, it was the Hellenistic insistence upon the all-importance of doctrine and faith which lay at the root of the theory. The old Hebrews, so far as they had any principle at the root of their persecuting zeal, based it upon the anti-social practices, to which the worship of Baal, of Moloch, or of Asherah led. Both Catholics and Protestants deliberately waged war against doctrine or opinion, though, of course, in the last resort they would have contended that this had a deleterious effect upon national character and had to be guarded against as insidious moral contagion. There was further a survival of the Greco-Roman conception of the collective liability of the citizens to the gods of the state,

ing cohabited with a Jewess, which was thus regarded as an unnatural offence. Evans, *Criminal Prosecution of Animals*, p. 165.

which would cause the transgression of one citizen against the gods to bring down their wrath against the whole state.¹ Divergent opinion in theological matters was thus regarded as a sort of moral smallpox, which the state was justified in exterminating by any means, however severe. Both sides in the Protestant-Catholic controversy were therefore eager to display their zeal for the faith, as was shown in the legal murder of Servetus by Calvin.

Yet the mere existence of dissidents from the state belief, both in Protestant and in Catholic countries, brought about a state of affairs which led ultimately to the toleration of different beliefs within the state, from which Jews finally benefited. The stages are fairly clear, and in each of them Jews had directly, or indirectly, considerable influence.²

¹ There is, of course, a trace of this conception in the Hebraic theocracy, as shown in the leading case of Achan, but the strong individualism of the prophets reduced its significance.

² I follow, for the general outlines, E. S. P. Haynes, *Religious Persecution; a Study of Political Psychology*, London, 1904. Bishop Creighton's Hulsean lectures, *Persecution and Tolerance*, London, 1895, are scarcely an adequate treatment of the subject, and do not do justice to his powers. Sir Frederick Pollock's essay on "The Theory of Persecution," in his *Essays in Jurisprudence*, 1882, pp. 144-75, is still slighter.

After the first lining-up of the two forces in Germany had shown that it would be impossible to carry out the mediæval practice of exterminating heresy by burning up the heretics, a compromise was reached at the Peace of Augsburg, 1555, by which the religion of each separate state was to be determined by that of its ruler. This principle, enshrined in the phrase "*Cujus regio, ejus religio*," did not imply any toleration within the state of divergent religious opinion from the state church, but allowed, or compelled, the holders of such opinions to transfer their allegiance elsewhere. In other words, banishment was substituted for incineration as a punishment for heresy. Within the state the legislation "*De Heretico Comburendo*" was still operative, as was seen, on a large scale, in the England of Bloody Queen Mary; but it was applied to Protestants in Catholic lands and to Catholics in Protestant countries. But here was international toleration and recognition of alien faiths between states, though there was, as yet, no intra-national tolerance.

Now it is scarcely possible that, in thus substituting banishment for burning, the rulers of the different states had not in mind a consistent

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

application of this principle to Jews throughout the Middle Ages. Whenever a city or a state had had enough of its Jews, it banished them; the motives may have been mainly economic, but the ground for such action was the divergence of creed. Certainly decrees of banishment were applied more frequently to Jews in this period than to dissenters from the Church-States. During the fifteen years preceding the Peace of Augsburg, in 1555, Jews were refused entrance to the Rhenish Palatinate in 1540, expelled from Naples and Meissen in 1541, from Bohemia in 1542, from Basel, Zwickau, Plaun, and Leobschuetz in 1543, from Austria in 1544, from Landau and Asslingen in 1545, from Colmar in 1549, from Genoa in 1550, from Bavaria and Würtemberg in 1551, from Brunswick in 1553, and from the Palatinate in 1555. With these examples before them, it would not be difficult for the Diet of Augsburg to determine upon banishment as an alternative to conversion for dissenters from the state church.

Similarly in the next stage of toleration, represented by the Edict of Nantes, 1598, both Jewish example and indirect influence are discernible. It cannot be by chance that the three

most prominent voices among the Politiques, who laid down the principles which were to result in the Edict—Michel de l'Hopital, Jean Bodin, and Michel de Montaigne—were all partly of Jewish race. Montaigne, for example, had a Jewish mother, a Protestant brother, while himself a strict professing Catholic. The existence of these divergent creeds within their own families cannot have failed to influence the Politiques to work out a practical plan for securing intra-national toleration.¹ All of them recognized the desirability of one creed for the state, if it could be made effectual, and therefore allowed the theoretical right to persecution. They only adopted toleration as a practical *pis aller*; once it had been shown that persecution had failed, they contended that toleration of a second creed (not necessarily of more) was the only practical means of securing the state against anarchy.

It is probable, however, that the example of Poland had also some bearing upon the views of the Politiques and their illustrious follower,

¹ On their views see the chapter of J. N. Figgis on "The Politiques and Religious Toleration," in his excellent book, *From Gerson to Grotius*, Cambridge, 1907.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

Henry IV. Poland was the one state in mediæval Europe in which creed and citizenship did not, indeed could not, go together. From the year 1386 the Catholic kingdom of Poland and the Orthodox duchy of Lithuania had been united under the same Jagellon dynasty; and the Catholic Church in Poland dared not persecute Lithuanian subjects of the same king because they were of the Greek Church, nor deny their "Polish" citizenship, and similarly in Lithuania the co-existence of different creeds, in the same state system, had to be permitted. As a consequence, it was easy for the Polish-Lithuanian kingdom to admit the existence of a third creed; and we accordingly find that Poland formed the asylum for the dispossessed Jews of Germany throughout the fifteenth century. This indeed accounts for the fact that, even to the present day, more than half the Jews of the world are still to be found within the confines of Old Poland, where they speak the archaic German known as Yiddish, which they brought with them thither in the fifteenth century. This tolerated existence of so large a number of persons, notoriously holding anti-Trinitarian views, must have helped in the spread in Poland of the doc-

trines of Lelio Sozzini and his nephew, Fausto Sozzini, after whom anti-Trinitarianism was called Socinianism. Protestantism, in all its forms, had also spread widely in Poland, and the variegated religious aspect of the country became familiar to the Politiques during the two years 1573-4, in which Henry, duke of Anjou, was king of Poland.

Unfortunately the influence of the Politiques applied only to France, where the only Jews were new Christians of Bordeaux and Marseilles, though Henry IV entered into negotiations with the secret Jews of Spain in 1595, and granted privileges to the few Jews of Metz under his jurisdiction in 1602. Meanwhile, however, there had arisen in Europe a state which, from the very first, was committed to practical toleration. The United States of the Netherlands were a republic, and therefore had no dynastic connection with any of the ruling creeds, and at the same time their first stadtholder was, by conviction and experience, the first princely advocate of genuine toleration. But, besides this, the whole basis of the Dutch Commonwealth was economic; their strength consisted in their command of the North Sea fisheries. Now com-

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

merce, like war, regards efficiency, apart from birth or creed, as the sole test of service. Holland was thus the first type of the Welfare State, which regarded the material welfare of its citizens as its chief aim, and its phenomenal success made it a rival to the Church-State, which had hitherto formed the only type of the European State system. It was not, therefore, surprising that, as soon as the Batavian republic was firmly established, a colony of Spanish Jews settled at Amsterdam in 1593, and soon proved their value as citizens by their participation in the higher finance of the republic, owing to their family relations with the Marranos spread throughout the Spanish and Portuguese dominions. England soon followed the example of Holland by the re-admission of Jews under Cromwell, and there were the beginnings of the same policy by Colbert, at least as regards the French colonial empire, in his rescript of May 23, 1671.¹

Meanwhile there came forth from Holland the first plea for absolute toleration, and, characteristically enough, it emanated from a Dutch Jew. Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*

¹ *Revue des Études Juives*, ii, 99.

contained the first contention that the state, as such, had no concern with the private opinions on religion or other subjects of its citizens.¹ The book aroused much scandal owing to its free thought on theological topics, and thereby attracted the more attention to its plea for toleration.

Spinoza's view of the functions of the state were derived (possibly through Hobbes) from Jean Bodin, the chief theorist of the *Politiques*. This regarded the state as the source of all law, and gave currency to the notion of a "Compact Omnicompetent Sovereign," from whose dictates there was no appeal. Under Locke and Austin this was destined to become the foundation of Anglo-Saxon law; in itself it could be used to buttress the most complete absolutism, as by Hobbes and the French jurists; but by confining the commands of the sovereign to secular affairs, as advocated by Spinoza, it could leave an opening for complete toleration, as was shown in the English Toleration Act of 1689, which

¹ Sir Thomas More, in his *Utopia*, had indeed advocated general toleration, but only as a far-distant ideal, and he himself proved to be a consistent persecutor when Lord Chancellor and keeper of Henry VIII's conscience. Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers*.

marks the third stage in the progress of European toleration.

This act was one of real toleration, that is, while recognizing a dominant religion (the Established Church, or rather two Established Churches, Anglicanism in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland), it regards dissent as not, of itself, an offence against law. This is far indeed from true religious liberty or equality, since it does not give dissenters equal political rights, though it grants them, so far as possible, full civic rights and protects all peaceable and decent worship. As Tom Paine remarks somewhere, toleration once regarded as a favor would nowadays be considered an insult. But it was a great advance on intolerance and persecution, which did not allow even civil liberty to dissenters from the state Church. The fact that it was granted in England by a Dutch prince, William III, is significant. Its chief literary defender, John Locke, had passed some time in Holland, and there, doubtless, learnt the principles which he expounded in his *Letters on Toleration*.

It is possible also that there was some reflex influence of the growing spirit of toleration and

even of equality in the American colonies of England. The Lords Baltimore in Maryland, Roger Williams in Connecticut, William Penn in Pennsylvania and in New Jersey, had practically established religious toleration in those states, while New York, under its Dutch governors, had, for the most part, adopted the toleration of the home country. These states gave henceforth a bright example of a possibility of citizens working for the common good of the state, while each worshipping God in his own way.¹ These were followed early in the next century by the constitution of Georgia, laid down by the author of the *Letters on Toleration*. As a test case, mention may be made of the reception of a certain number of Jews in New York in 1654, after their being expelled from Brazil, when recaptured by the Portuguese from the Dutch. Old Peter Stuyvesant, the governor, was in some doubt, but, on referring the matter to Amsterdam, was ordered to carry out the general Dutch policy of toleration.

It cannot be said that Jews had much direct

¹ See S. H. Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, 1902, which can be supplemented by O. S. Straus' *Roger Williams*, and *Origin of Religious Liberty*.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

influence on this third stage of toleration, though, as we have seen, it was dominated by Holland, where Jewish influence was shown by the respect paid to Manassch ben Israel and the interest aroused by Spinoza. But the advantages gained through the toleration of Jews by Holland certainly affected the progress of the principle of toleration as applied to them, as we have seen in the examples of Cromwell and Colbert, and even in Germany there grew up a class of tolerated Jews ("Tolerierte Juden," "Schutz-Juden"), and the Great Elector not alone received Huguenots after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 1685, but had previously invited to Berlin the Jews expelled from Vienna in 1670. Yet, though tolerated, they were burdened with a number of degrading disabilities; the numbers were limited, both directly and also by restricting the annual number of marriages among them; they still had to bear the badge or other distinctive marks, were mostly confined to ghetti, and were not allowed access to the oligarchic guilds that ruled all trade, and, above all, were laden with innumerable taxes, which made the rulers as much sharers in their usury as the mediæval kings.¹

¹ A. Dietz, in his *Stammbuch der Frankfurter Juden*, 1907, pp.

The fourth stage in the history of religious liberty, as applied to Jews and others, began with the French Revolution, and will be considered in the next chapter, in dealing with the general relations of Jews and Liberalism. But it remains to consider how far they were connected with what Lecky, Leslie Stephen, Mr. Baynes, and others consider to be the underlying cause of increasing toleration culminating in religious equality. All these investigators consider that the real underlying cause of increasing laxity toward heresy and dissent was the growth of scepticism about dogmatic religion caused by the Renaissance and the growth of scientific inquiry. At the very beginning of the movement, Pomponazzi, the typical sceptic of the Renaissance, had put the difficulty, raised by the co-existence of the three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam: "If the three religions are false, all men are deceived; if only one is true, the majority are deceived." And Montaigne had put the practical difficulty clearly when he declared that men ought to be very

400-7, gives a list of not less than thirty-four different kinds of taxes and impositions to which the Jews of Frankfort were subjected.

sure of their own faith before burning other men for disbelieving it. When these other men were often relatives, friends, and neighbors, practical men felt increasingly the difficulty of carrying out the stern logic of the Churches; the divergence of faith was an infectious moral disease that had to be stamped out at all costs. Soon sarcasm was to add its undermining influence to the direct assaults of rationalism; Bayle, Swift, Voltaire, and Diderot were to complete the work of the Politiques and the Dutch. It thus came about that, while at the beginning of the period we are now considering it would have seemed absurd for a Catholic or a Calvinist not to save the soul of his heretical neighbor by burning his body, the same conduct would seem monstrous to men who were looking forward to strangling the last of the kings with the entrails of the last of the priests. Persecution that seemed inevitable and logical in the sixteenth century had grown to be detestable by the lapse of two centuries.

It is difficult to say whether Jews had much direct influence on this more subtle cause of toleration. The general influence of the demi-Jew Montaigne, in making scepticism the re-

ligion of all men of the world throughout Western Europe, can scarcely be exaggerated, and Emerson rightly takes him as the type of the sceptic. But while the existence of a Jewish mother and a Protestant brother may account for Montaigne's toleration, his scepticism was individual, as is shown by the contrasting case of the demi-Jew Bodin, who, while equally tolerant, was a consistent and rigorous believer in witchcraft. The existence of so large a number of Marranos, professing one creed and secretly believing and observing another, resulted, occasionally, in the appearance of a Jewish sceptic like Uriel Acosta or Orobio de Castro; but there is absolutely no evidence of any widespread scepticism about their own faith, or about religion in general, among the Jews of this period, which is characterized, indeed, more by the growth of superstition among them. The great controversy of the age was that between Jacob Emden and Jonathan Eybeschuetz about the efficacy of amulets.

Just on the eve of the Revolution the rationalism of the age made its appearance in Judaism with the remarkable personality of Moses Mendelssohn. By showing himself the intellectual

equal of the highest German minds of his time, he prepared the way for his fellow-Jews to acquire the open career; and by breaking down their prejudices against adopting European culture with which, during the preceding two centuries, Jews had failed to keep up, owing to their forced migrations, increased persecution, and social isolation, he enabled them to take advantage of the opportunities which were about to be offered to them.

CHAPTER IX

JEWS AND LIBERALISM

THE eighteenth century was the era of the "benevolent despots" like Frederick II, Joseph II, Catherine II, who adopted the ruling principle of the Welfare State that the object of government should be the good of the people, but considered that it could only be carried out for the people but not by them. The weakness of the principle consisted in the difficulty of securing a heritable succession of capable benevolence, and the collapse of Prussia at Jena and of Joseph II's well-meant but unreflective reforms led, in the nineteenth century, to the triumph of the principle, first enunciated in America and carried out in France, of government for the people by the people. The transition to the next stage, from religious toleration to religious liberty, is marked, as regards the Jews, by the tolerance edict of Joseph II in 1781, which, for the first time, threw open service in the army to the Jews, and placed them, to some extent, on the same level with other dissenters from the state Church of Austria.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

But this was still toleration and not liberty, and was soon cast into the background by the full religious liberty granted by the French Revolution in 1791 in imitation of the clause in the American Constitution of 1787, which entirely separated State and Church. The granting of full religious liberty to Jews had previously been advocated by Mirabeau, and, though Rousseau's influence, which was all-important in the Revolution, still retained a touch of Genevan intolerance, Jews came within his religious requirements for citizenship by their belief in Providence and in future reward and punishment. It has to be remembered that in spirit, if not in will-power or influence, Louis XVI was of the school of the benevolent despots, and it was he who signed the edict of November 13, 1791, which placed, for the first time in European history, Jews on the same level as the adherents of all other creeds as regards civil and political qualifications. Holland was appropriately the first country to grant the same religious equality to its Jews.¹

¹ It is perhaps worth while remarking that one of the most prominent leaders on the Jewish side in Holland, Herz Bromet, had lived as a free Burgher in Surinam for a long time, and that the example of America, especially New York State, was adduced in favor of the movement. (Graetz, xi, 230-1.)

The French Revolution, from our present standpoint, is the more remarkable inasmuch as it is the only great European movement on which Jews had absolutely no influence, direct or indirect, owing to their inappreciable numbers and insecure position in the chief centers, Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles; they were influenced by it, not it by them. As the Revolution principles spread into the neighboring countries with the French arms, in Venice the walls of the original ghetto, from which all the rest received their names, fell at once on the entry of Napoleon's troops. No wonder they welcomed with fervor the victories of the French troops; and we can catch in Heine echoes of the enthusiasm with which Napoleon was acclaimed as the Liberator.

Napoleon's own attitude was not so uniformly friendly to Jews. On his way back from Austerlitz, in 1805, he learnt, at Strassburg, of the wide distress caused in Alsace by the exactions of certain Jewish usurers in that province, and on his return to Paris issued edicts directed against the Alsatian Jews, restricting their usurious activity. It is fair to add that these enactments were obviously directed against the usury of these Alsatian Jews, and not against Jews in general, since

they were specifically declared not to apply to the Jews of Bordeaux in the South or Northern Italy then under Napoleon's control. It would indeed have been against the whole tendency of his career to have made the Jews an exception to that principle of the *carrière ouverte aux talents*, which was the keynote to his whole policy, as it is logically to all war-lords. It was by no accident that similar indifference towards the creed of their soldiers, or civil servants, was shown by William the Silent, Wallenstein, Cromwell, William III, and Frederick the Great.

Napoleon's attention having thus been drawn to the Jewish question, he proceeded, with characteristic energy, to solve it by summoning to Paris a representative assembly of the Jews of France, Germany, and Italy, who should determine on what terms Jews could be admitted into a modern Country-State, which had been freed from the shackles of the mediæval Church-State, and only recognized a certain prerogative in the Church to which the majority of Frenchmen belonged (the Concordat of 1802). After summoning an assembly of Jewish notables for a preliminary inquiry, in 1806, a more formal Sanhedrin was summoned in the following year, to

which twelve test questions were submitted, among them, whether the French Jews could regard France as their fatherland and Frenchmen as their brothers, and the laws of the state as binding upon them. Further points were raised as to polygamy, divorce, and mixed marriages; remaining questions related to the position of rabbis and the Jewish laws about usury. All these problems were decided to the satisfaction of Napoleon, though some of them aroused much searching of heart among the more strictly orthodox. The outcome legally recognized that there was nothing in Jewish law or faith which prevented its adherents from being legitimate and full members of a modern state which, at that time, practically recognized Catholicism as the state Church. The significance of the decision was far-reaching not alone for the Jews but for the whole European State system; it was a practical recognition that the country, not the faith, was the foundation of a nation, and thus gave the final blow to the conception of a Church-Empire, which had upheld the contrary principle. It was not without significance that simultaneously the emperor of Austria agreed to the dissolution of the Holy Roman empire.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

But though the Jews had had no influence on the French Revolution and no share in Napoleon's revolutionary reorganization of West Europe, next to the serfs they reaped the most benefit from both movements, because these were the two most oppressed classes under the feudal system still surviving. Accordingly, they imbibed with enthusiasm the libertarian principles of the Revolution and the "open career" administration of Napoleon. They threw off with avidity most of the shackles which prevented their joining in general European culture, and Jewish parents of means immediately began giving their sons and, what is more, their daughters the secular education which would adapt them to the careers which now seemed to be open to them as publicists, lawyers, and civil servants. When the reaction came, under the Holy Alliance, with its attempt to revive the Church-State and the closed career of prerogative, Jews everywhere in Western Europe joined the Liberal forces, from whose triumph alone they could hope for a dispersal of the clouds which once more obscured the sun of liberty, in which they had basked for a few short years. Jews soon ranked among the intellectual leaders of continental Liberalism, and

from 1815 to 1848 exercised an appreciable influence on the course of public opinion. In particular a brilliant band of Jewish *littérateurs* in Germany helped to mediate between French Liberalism and German public opinion, and practically led the movement known as Young Germany, which opposed the cosmopolitan tendencies of the eighteenth century to the narrow nationalism of the Reaction and advocated the Revolution principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, as against the revival of the claims of authority and privilege by the Holy Alliance. Börne and Heine, Hartmann and Saphir, Jacoby and Karl Marx, are recognized by friends and foes alike as among the leading influences which led ultimately to the downfall of Metternich and his school.

They were aided in their Liberal tendencies by a remarkable group of emancipated Jewesses, who introduced into Germany the vogue of the political salon after the manner of Madame Roland and Madame de Staël. They were mostly from the Berlin circle, which had arisen around Moses Mendelssohn, and carried his tendencies towards rationalism and culture to extreme limits. His two daughters, Dorothea and Henriette, and

their friends Henriette Herz and Rahel Levin, created salons to which were attracted some of the more liberal spirits of the cultured world of Berlin. Dorothea Mendelssohn ultimately married Friedrich von Schlegel, and became one of the Muses of the German romantic school. Publicists of distinction like Wilhelm von Humboldt and Friedrich von Gentz formed, with her and others of her circle, a "Bond of Virtue" (Tugendbund), which, according to all appearances, was named on the principle of *lucus a non lucendo*. Rahel, "the little woman with a great soul," as Goethe called her, was even a more striking personality. She numbered among her friends men of such different types as Schelling and Schleiermacher, the Prince de Ligne and Fichte, Schlegel and Gutzkow, Prince Louis Ferdinand, Frederick the Great's nephew, and Fouqué, Gentz, and the Humboldts, and she finally married Varnhagen von Ense. She was the first to appreciate, to its full extent, the multi-form genius of Goethe, and helped the rise to fame of Börne, Heine, and Victor Hugo. She was undoubtedly the most striking personality among the women of her age in Germany, and is

nowadays regarded as one of the chief fore-runners of the Feminist movement.¹

These salons had an air of cultured Bohemianism, which attracted many men of rank in Mid-Europe who were beginning to be repelled by the exactions of social gatherings in which all associations were determined by armorial bearings. A similar salon was held in Vienna by Baroness von Arnstein, in whose mansion all the diplomats of the Congress of Vienna met as on neutral ground.² Such gatherings, while helping to liberalize good society in Mid-Europe, also brought the position of Jews to the notice of the ruling classes, and, in many cases, aroused a determination to repair their wrongs. You cannot accept a man socially yet refuse him the most elementary rights politically.

The Revolution of 1830 brought into European prominence the two most brilliant members of Rahel's coterie, Ludwig Börne and Heinrich Heine. Both had made their mark as *littérateurs* in the preceding decade, but Börne's *Letters*

¹ See Ellen Key, *Rahel Levin*.

² Similar salons were held later by distinguished Jewesses like Countess Waldegrave, in London, and Madame Raffalovitch, in Paris; and the Rothschilds have throughout made their houses centers of the most cultured influence.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

from *Paris* and Heine's *French Conditions* (contributed to the *Augsburger Zeitung*) drew the attention of all liberal Germany to the new hopes aroused by the downfall of the absolutist monarchy in France. Henceforth they were the dominating voices in arousing among the German Liberals the hope of similar liberty, while in France itself they helped to bring to the knowledge of French culture the deeper currents of German thought and literature. In particular their brilliant wit and incisive sarcasm set the tone for the feuilleton literature of all Mid-Europe. By their very isolation they were enabled to regard men and affairs with a certain detachment, and they both wrote with an iridescent insolence which can only be described by the Jewish technical word *Hutzpah*. Treitschke complained of their frequent irreverences and flippancies, but in both respects Heine, "the wittiest Frenchman since Voltaire," was merely following in the footsteps of his predecessor, and Börne, like Diderot, knew that the most effective weapon against authority is sarcasm.¹

¹ Treitschke, in the *Bilder* extracted from his history, does more than justice to the Jewish influence on German Liberalism. His anti-Semitism, as so often happens, made him see Jewish influence where it was not, and exaggerated it where it existed.

Under their leadership a whole school of liberal journalists arose in Germany and Austria, many of them Jews like Saphir and Hartmann, and they have given a tone to Mid-European journalism which has lasted on to the present day. They thus helped to internationalize Liberalism of the French form, with its rather vague and indefinite strivings after liberty, equality, and fraternity, as contrasted with the Liberalism of the English type which, dominated by Jeremy Bentham, aimed at constitutional, economical, and social forms of a definite character. Young Germany, as represented by Heine and Börne, left the latter type of Liberalism severely alone.

Yet, in the struggle for constitutional liberty, which led to the Revolution of 1848, Jews took a considerable part on the more practical side. The agitation in Prussia may be said to have begun with Dr. Johann Jacoby's *Four Questions*, which gave rise to Herwegh's outburst of admiration (to which Mr. Houston Chamberlain's attention may justifiably be drawn) :

“Und wieder ob den Landen
Lag jüngst ein schwerer Bann:
Da ist ein Mann erstanden,
Ein ganzer, deutscher Mann.”

It was Jacoby who in 1848 stood out from a deputation to King Frederick William IV, when he refused to listen to them, and said: "It is the great misfortune of kings that they will not listen to the truth." At the Vorparlament at Frankfurt one of the most striking figures was Moritz Hartmann, who, with Karl Beck and Alfred Meissner, had constituted the chief poetic voices of Austrian Liberalism. In the March days at Berlin one of the most familiar figures was Leopold Zunz, the founder of Jewish science, and known familiarly to the Berlin populace as "Vater Zunz." Another Jewish scholar, Schiller-Szinessy, was a conspicuous figure in the Hungarian revolt, and a brother of Adolph Jellinek lost his life in the struggle. In Paris, Adolphe Crémieux was one of the leaders of the Revolutionary party, and in Italy the salon of Signora Nathan (mother of the late mayor of Rome, Ernesto Nathan) was a center for the adherents of Mazzini. Everywhere during that critical year Jews took a part, and often a leading part, in the upheaval against absolutism.¹

¹ No adequate or connected account has yet been given of the part taken by the Jews in the Revolution of 1848. Incidentally, a good deal of information is contained in the last volume of

Yet Jews were not altogether unrepresented among the Conservative forces, counting, indeed, two of their chief leaders, F. J. Stahl in Prussia and Benjamin Disraeli in England. Disraeli's is the better known name, but it is probable Stahl was equally influential.¹ He is described by Sir A. W. Ward in the *Cambridge Modern History*, xi, 395, as "the intellectual leader of the conservative aristocratic party and the most remarkable brain in the Upper Chamber . . . he largely supplied the ruling party with the learning and wealth of ideas on which to found their claims. Their organ was the *Kreuzzeitung*, and the party was called by its name." Bluntschli calls him, "after Hegel the most important representative of the philosophical theory of the State. He, in many ways, advanced political science by his dialectical and critical ability in founding new points of view."² But Stahl's historic influence will

G. Brandes, *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature*, vi, "Young Germany."

¹ Lord Acton, in his *Letters to Mary Gladstone*, p. 200, declares that Stahl was the greater man; but Acton, from his close relations with Gladstone, was a somewhat prejudiced witness. Döllinger, who was an equally competent judge, ranked Disraeli higher.

² *The Theory of the State*, p. 73.

probably rest on his connection with Bismarck at the formative period of his career, when the future chancellor was also a member of the *Kreuzzeitung* party.

Disraeli's career and influence is far better known and need not be further adverted to in this place. The fact that both were converts has little significance from our present point of view, since many of the Jewish leaders on the Liberal side had also adopted Christianity. It is more pertinent to remark that one cannot trace their conservatism to their Judaism, since there was everything in the Jewish position of their time to range Jews on the Liberal side. Stahl and Disraeli are, therefore, to be regarded merely as examples of Jewish ability. There is nothing specifically Jewish in their influence, unless we regard the socialistic strain in Disraeli's conception of "Young England" as a part of the Jewish sympathy with the "under-dog," which can be attributed to their own experiences and to the traditions of the prophets.

Certainly we find a strong Jewish participation throughout the socialistic movement which, from its inception up to the present day, has been largely dominated by Jewish influence. Modern

socialism can be traced back to St. Simon, but yet, at the death of the master, the whole movement would have collapsed but for the organizing ability of Olinde Rodrigues and the religious enthusiasm of his brother Eugene. A practical turn was also given by their cousins, Isaac and Jacob Pereire, who, as bankers, had thought out the best means of carrying out the principles of the school in practical life. An extension of the facilities for banking would lower the rate of interest and therefore leave more to be distributed to the workers, while the development of railways would reduce the cost of transportation and thus lower the cost of living and raise real wages. Accordingly, the Pereires devoted themselves, with religious enthusiasm, to creating the Credit Foncier, and later the Credit Mobilier, and were the chief agents in developing the railway system of Northern France, incidentally making themselves multi-millionaires in the process, though they never lost their enthusiasm for the socialistic ideals.¹

Most of these left the St. Simonian Church

¹They got their altruistic tendencies from their family connections. Their uncle, Jacob Rodrigues Pereire (1750-80), was the first teacher of deaf-mutes.

when it diverged into the sexual vagaries of Enfantin, though one of his creeds was: "I believe that God has raised up Saint Simon to teach the Father (Enfantin) through Rodrigues." Felicien David, the musician, however, accompanied Enfantin on his epoch-making journey to Egypt, in which he implanted the idea of the Suez Canal in the minds of Muhammed Ali and Ferdinand de Lesseps, and Gustave d'Eichthal devoted his enthusiasm and energies to creating, out of the ideas of St. Simon and Enfantin, a new religion which should revert to the socialism of the prophets, while denying or ignoring, like them, any other life than this. It is said that he consulted Heine as to the best means of founding such a religion. "Get crucified and rise again on the third day," was Heine's caustic reply.¹ Enfantin's vagaries, while they destroyed any direct practical outcome for St. Simonism, drew wide attention to its views, and Jews helped in their spread throughout Europe, Moritz Veit performing that function in Germany, and M. Parma

¹ The socialistic tone of J. S. Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, which differentiates it from its Ricardoan predecessors, is undoubtedly due, in large measure, to his intercourse with d'Eichthal. See their correspondence, and compare L. Stephen, *The English Utilitarians*, iii, 46.

in Italy.¹ The cosmopolitan position of Jews is seen at its best in such propagandism, and it is not surprising that they should have been attracted by views the kernel of which were to be found in the prophets of Israel, whom indeed Renan, in his *Histoire d'Israel*, brilliantly characterized as socialistic preachers.²

The later stages of socialism in Europe were, as is well known, dominated by Karl Marx, who based upon Ricardo's "iron law" of wages the imposing edifice of *Das Kapital*, for long the gospel of advanced socialism. The brilliant Ferdinand Lassalle introduced its principles into German politics, and the most recent stages of German socialism have been controlled by the opportunism of E. Bernstein, while among its most prominent leaders have been V. Adler and Paul Singer.

This participation of Jewish intellect and sympathies with the Liberal current in European politics made Jewish emancipation a part of the Liberal creed throughout Europe. Jews were

¹ A. J. Booth, *Saint-Simon and Saint-Simonism*, 1871, p. 165.

² Georges Weill, the historian of the St. Simonian movement, contributed an interesting essay on *Les Juifs et le Saint-Simonisme* in *Revue des Études Juives*, xxxi, pp. 261-273.

fighting for themselves in fighting for the general liberties, and their position in the forefront of the struggle was thus justified by the representative principle at the root of modern Liberalism. Jewish disabilities were the last stronghold of the old Church-State conception, and the struggle on the side of the Reaction, to retain this fundamental principle, was the more intense. If Jews were granted full civil and political rights, it could no longer be contended that Christianity was a fundamental principle of the State (or, as the English *obiter dictum* put it, "Christianity is a parcel of the common law"). Hence the extreme violence of the defence, which seems, at first sight, out of all proportion to the interests or numbers involved. Thus the struggle was as embittered in Switzerland as anywhere, though the Jews there only constituted a handful, and the traditions of the country were in favor of toleration.

From this aspect the fight in England is typical. As soon as the Catholics had obtained emancipation in 1828 (the Jews had stood aside in order not to complicate the question), Jewish emancipation became part of the Liberal creed, and the struggle was waged in parliament, or rather in

the House of Lords, for the ensuing thirty years.¹ England was the home of toleration, and her Toleration Act, passed as early as 1689, formed the third stage in the European progress toward religious liberty. Yet the more conservative elements in English life fought against the removal of Jewish disabilities because it meant the visible proof of the secularization of English politics. It is perhaps characteristic that the Tory resistance was mainly broken down by Disraeli, of Jewish, and by Lord George Bentinck, of Dutch descent.

With Jewish emancipation in England, Liberalism reached its acme about 1860. Complete civil and religious liberty was gained for Jews throughout Western Europe during the next decade, in the German confederation and in Switzerland, 1866, in Austria and Hungary, 1867, and in the German empire, 1871, while even in Spain the expulsion order was practically repealed, and toleration, if not liberty, was given to Jews there

¹ Jewish emancipation in England is thus a striking example of Dicey's law that thirty years generally elapse before a change in public opinion is reflected in legislation (*Law and Public Opinion in England*.) But against this law is the struggle in Prussia, which lasted for fifty years, from 1816 to 1866.

in 1869. By that time Liberalism, both in the French sense of liberty and equality before the law and in the English sense of constitutional government and free-trade, had gained its fullest triumph, and had spent its force. Its negative work had been most valuable; it had freed the human spirit from intolerable shackles and thrown into the lumber-room the clogging survivals of mediæval Feudalism. But to the human spirit thus freed it had little instruction to give of a constructive kind; its slogan seemed to be "Go as you please," or, to use its own formula, *laissez faire, laissez aller*. It was rather superficial in its treatment of national and social forces, and made no appeal to the more generous imaginative emotions. It was inevitable that a reaction should set in, if only to fill the void. Nationalism which had given vitality to France under Napoleon, and in Spain, Russia, and Prussia had brought down his downfall, was opposed to Liberal cosmopolitanism. Protection to native industry, which had, only for a moment and in England, lost its hold, replaced free-trade, and the strong individualism of "Manchestertum" was drowned in the rising flood of Collectivism, whether in the more formal guise of socialism or in the vaguer

tendencies of philanthropy. In none of these currents of opinion had Jews a prominent voice except, as we have seen, in the latter, though there they were mainly effective in opposition and criticism.

All these tendencies, which may roughly be summed up as the Counter-Revolution, found a home in victorious Prussia and a voice in Otto von Bismarck, its representative statesman. As we have seen, his views on the nature of the State had been influenced in his formative period by F. J. Stahl, and his socialistic sympathies may possibly have been aroused by Ferdinand Lassalle; but he was of too independent a character to submit much to external influences, and the tendencies he represented, *Junkertum* and *Militarism*, were entirely opposed to Jewish Liberalism. For some fifteen years he found it convenient to work with the National Liberal party, to which all German Jews belonged, and among whose leaders the most prominent were two Jews, Eduard Lasker and Ludwig Bamberger. But in 1878 he broke with the party, and let loose the forces of "anti-Semitism" as a means of discrediting them. The movement, thus encouraged by Bismarck, soon spread to Austria and was transformed in Russia

into the Pogroms of 1881. In France the Royalists and Jesuits conceived hopes of reviving the Church-State, and adopted anti-Semitism as a means of discrediting not alone Jews but also Protestants and other opponents of Catholicism. Their adherents, the French nobility, were especially embittered against the Jews by the bankruptcy of the Union Générale, a banking establishment in which all their money had been placed in the hope of wresting the control of French finance from the hands of the Rothschilds. Their chief hope lay in getting control of the General Staff, by filling its posts with young men of noble birth, trained by Jesuits. In order to attain this, they schemed to remove all Jews and Protestants from the Staff, and thought they had found a rare chance in their perverse persecution of Captain Alfred Dreyfus. Their scheme recoiled on their own heads, and the final result of the Dreyfus *affaire* was to break the alliance of clericalism and militarism, at least in France.

The Dreyfuss *affaire* was specially significant as bringing into play, at one time, all the forces that have given vitality to anti-Semitism. The New Nationalism, based not on country but on race and fostered by chauvinistic anthropologists

as well as historians, the revived Church spirit, which sees in the National Church not so much the guardian of Christian truth as a spiritual bond of national unity, the New Collectivism, which sees in capitalism the chief anti-social force, and the revived militarist spirit which glorifies war as the regenerator of the nation—all these movements combine to regard the Jew, considered as alien, infidel, capitalist, and pacifist, as the representative enemy. All the reactionary forces regard a revival of the mediæval Church-State as both the means and the end of their strivings, and naturally find the position of the Jew, both theoretically and practically, one of the chief stumbling-blocks in their way.

We have now traced, through the Christian centuries, the State ideal of Europe, with special reference to the position of the Jews in the various European countries as fixed by these political ideals. We have seen the Church-Empire, after the downfall of Arianism, forcing upon the European states the principle that citizenship should be identical with orthodoxy. This prevented the Jew from becoming a citizen in the mediæval states, though, owing to his Roman citizenship

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

and general usefulness, first as merchant, then as capitalist, and throughout as intermediary, he was permitted to hold a tolerated, though intentionally degraded, position. He was retained as a Christian evidence, yet at the same time as a warning of the results of rejecting Christian truth. The experiment of using the Jew as an indirect tax-gatherer proved, in most cases, too costly, and resulted ultimately in his expulsion from most of the states of Western Europe, and his concentration in the Turkish empire or in the dual kingdom of Poland-Lithuania, which had to be quasi-tolerant because its constituent elements were of different sections of the Christian faith.

When the Church-Empire broke up into different Church-States at the time of the Reformation, the condition of the Jews became worsened in the national papacies thus formed, owing to the religious animosities aroused by the reforming spirit. Protestants felt bound to show that they were equally eager for the faith and opposed to the enemies of Christ as their Catholic opponents. Yet the actual existence of dissenting parties within Christianity led by degrees to increasing internal toleration, first by allowing a certain liberty of choice in the creed of the Church-State

(Peace of Augsburg, 1555), then by allowing a certain autonomy to a single dissenting creed (Edict of Nantes, 1598), and finally by permitting civil, though not political, equality to all Christian dissenters from the established Church (Act of Toleration, 1689). Yet Jews gained little by this advance in toleration, since the principle that Christianity was part of the state law was still rigorously upheld.

Meanwhile there was rising, under the influence of the New World, a conception of the state ideal, which regarded the welfare of the whole people as the true aim of social organization, and welcomed the co-operation of all citizens, without distinction of creed, toward that end. This phase is represented by the rise of the Netherlands. This commercial form of religious toleration (not religious liberty) is found wherever Dutch influence extends, in New Amsterdam, in the England of Cromwell and William III, and even in the Prussia dynastically connected with Holland. At the same time the same principle was naturally applied in the professional armies which grew up during the Wars of Religion, and, in increasing measure, the soldiers of William the Silent, of Cromwell, of Wil-

liam III, of Frederick the Great, and of Carnot and Napoleon were welcomed without distinction of creed or race, provided they were efficient. Thus both commerce and war tended to break down the associations of citizenship and creed within the Church-States, and the general trend of the American and French Revolutions laid down the principle of full religious liberty by which Jews were ultimately to profit under the growth of nineteenth century Liberalism.

In all this movement Jews had directly very little influence, though, as we have seen, the political theories of Bodin and Spinoza and the general sceptical movement headed by Montaigne affected public opinion that was ultimately to be enshrined in law.¹ But their indirect influence was the greater; they were the supreme example of fidelity to creed, notwithstanding the attempts of the different states to crush or entice them. Their steadfastness, combined with the influence of their own Scriptures, served as an example for the resolute Protestants, who declined to be forced into belief in the dominant creed. Religious

¹ Montaigne's sceptical influence, however, was individual, not Jewish, though his views on toleration were, doubtless, influenced by his mixed relationships.

liberty has been rightly described as the parent of political liberty; but for the clashing of the sects, the forces of absolutism would have crushed out both political and religious liberty, as they did in France and Spain. And religious liberty is of even more spiritual consequence than political, since it keeps alive the principle that there are certain spiritual ideals without which life itself is not worth living. The Jews have been the supreme example of devotion to this ideal, and have been silent, though effective, martyr witnesses, not so much of their own truth but of the supreme value of the ideal element in human nature and development.

It remains to be seen whether the ideals of religious and political liberty, which have thus been gained through so much blood and tears, will be preserved intact against the rising forces of the reaction and counter-revolution which are, at bottom, an attempt at a revival of the Church-Empire. The slogan, "One God, one king, one people," has again been raised, and armies that are nations in arms are in movement to the cry. Anti-Semitism is largely the result of this reaction, and while it is dominant in the councils of certain nations, Jews must once more take up

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION

their rôle of martyrs to the wider truth. Nowadays, however, they do not fight alone, and it is scarcely possible that, in Western Europe and in lands dominated by Western European ideals, they can be re-interned in their ghetti. But the Colossus of the North still retains the mediæval ideal of the Church-Empire, and while that controls Russian State policy, Jews will have to suffer, in all the Russias, indignities and disabilities from which they have been freed in the lands of true civilization and religious liberty.

The ideal of the unified Church-State has been shattered by the assaults of modern criticism and the growth of true religious liberty. But the conception of all the citizens of a compact territory animated by the same ideals still retains its attraction; only the unification nowadays is with regard to the goal rather than to the roads that lead to it. In other words, the Welfare State (interpreting welfare as spiritual as well as material) is taking the place of the Church-State of the Middle Ages and of Reformation times. What then is to become of the separate Churches or religious bodies which are found in profusion in modern states? That is the sole ecclesiastical problem which the modern statesman has to face.

Except among the extreme parties, such as the Ultramontanes, the obvious solution would seem to be that given by the modern federal constitution in which each state (in this case Church) has a corporate life of its own over which it has autonomous control, except in any case where this conflicts with the general federal ideals. The Jewish Synagogue may rightly claim its place among these Churches within the state as having its part in promoting the general welfare.¹

Owing to their mediæval disabilities, Jews, though sharing, as we have seen, in the higher life and in the commerce of Europe, were yet kept in a kind of enclave in each of the European nations, and thus acted, both intellectually and economically, as a separate body with distinctive tendencies caused by their isolation and disabilities. Accordingly, we have been able in the preceding pages to estimate roughly the part taken by the Jews as a body in the various movements which have made European civilization

¹ In this connection the title of Dr. Figgis's latest book, *The Churches in the State*, is significant as contrasted with the older treatise of Innes, *Church and State*. Dr. Figgis has been largely influenced by the views of Maitland and Giercke on the claims to independent life of the *Universitas*, or *Genossenschaft*, as against the *Societas*, or limited liability company.

what it is to-day. In all these movements (except possibly one, the French Revolution) we have seen the Jews, as Jews, contributing toward European culture while sharing in it themselves. Their monotheistic views and liturgic practices were the foundation of the mediæval Church, both in creed and deed. By their connection with their brethren in the East and their tolerated existence, both in Islam and in Christendom, they helped toward that transmission of Oriental thought, science, and commerce, which had so large an influence on the Middle Ages and led on to the Renaissance and the Reform, in both of which movements Jews had their direct part to play. So, too, in the struggle for religious liberty and in the different stages of toleration, which lay at the root of political liberty, Jews had their part to play, and, when freed from their shackles by the French Revolution, took a leading rôle both in nineteenth century Liberalism and in the Collectivism which has now replaced it.

But, when fully emancipated, Jews no longer acted in the European world of ideas collectively, but as individuals, often choosing opposite ideals and, in most cases, applying the talents thus let free to objects apart from the general political

or religious movements of the time. Great as has been the influence of Jews in their collective capacity on the development of European thought and culture up to the present day, it is possible that their influence as individuals, during the past fifty years, has been even more extensive, though less discernible, owing to the absence of any general direction to Jewish intellectuality. The remarkable outburst of Jewish talent, which has been so striking a characteristic since the age of emancipation, will form the subject of our next Book.

INDEX

- Aaron of Lincoln, 208.
 Abaelard, 167.
 Abarbanel, Don Judah, 180, 181.
 Abigdor, Abraham, 159.
 Abraham, a Jew, assists Ralph of Bruges, 146.
 Abraham bar Hiyya, 146, 149, 166, 184.
 Abrahams, Israel, 261.
 Acosta, Uriel, 291.
 Acton, Lord, 271, 305.
 Adler, V., 309.
 Æschylus, 81.
 Æsop's Fables, 64.
 Afer, Constantinus, 153, 182, 203.
 Agrippa, Cornelius, 176.
 Al-Battani, 151, 152.
 Albertus, Magnus, 165, 170, 172, 173, 181, 186.
 Albucasis, 154.
 Alcuin, 188.
 Alexander of Hales, 164, 170, 171, 172, 186, 188.
 Alexander II., Czar of Russia, 33.
 Al-Farghani, 146, 152.
 Alfonsi, Petrus, 155.
 Alfonsine Tables, 151.
 Alfonso N., of Castile, 145, 151, 152.
 Alfred the Englishman, 145.
 Alfred, King, *Dooms of*, 65.
 Al-Ghazali, 166.
 Al-Harizi, Judah, 146, 164, 167.
 Al-Heitham, 152.
 Al-Khwarizmi, Muhammed, 149.
 Al-Kindi, 152, 203.
 Allard, Jean, burning of, 276.
 Al-Mas'udi, 155, 203.
 Al-Zarkali, Ibrahim, 146, 151.
 Anabaptists, the, 273.
 Andrew, a Jew, Michael Scot's dragoman, 145, 156, 184.
 Angell, Norman, 86, 109.
 Anselm, 167, 186.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 14.
 Anti-Semitism, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 27, 28, 29, 35, 38, 54, 87, 88, 240, 302, 313, 314, 318.
 Aptowitzer, V., 94.
 Aquinas, Thomas, 165, 170, 172, 173, 181, 186, 206.
 Aristotle, 143, 156, 166, 168, 169, 172.
 Arminians, the, 270.
 Arnold, Matthew, 64, 178.
 Arnstein, Baroness von, 301.
 Aranicus, Jacob, alchemist, 162.
 Ashley, W. J., 207, 237.
 Atonement, doctrine of, 97.
 Auerbach, B., 178.
 Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, 95.
 Augustus, Philip, 210.
 Austin, 285.
 Aven Deuth; *see* John of Seville.
 Avenzoar, 146, 154, 158.
 Averroes, 146, 154, 156, 157, 166, 177, 180, 184.
 Averroism, 143, 156, 179.
 Avicbrol, 169; *see also* Ibn Gabirol.
 Avicbrom, 169; *see also* Ibn Gabirol.
 Avicbron, 169, 170, 171, 186; *see also* Ibn Gabirol.
 Avicenna, 166, 171, 203.

INDEX

- Bacon, Roger, 145, 146, 150, 156,
179, 188.
- Bagehot, 84.
- Bahya, 144, 166.
- Ballin, A., 241.
- Balmes, Abraham de, 152, 157
184.
- Baltimore, Lord, 287.
- Balzac, H., 241.
- Bamberger, Ludwig, 27, 313.
- Bardi, the, 220.
- Bardsley's *Curiosities of Puritan
Nomenclature*, 67.
- Baring, Sir Francis, 238, 239, 240.
- Barnato, Barnett, 243.
- Barrett, 203.
- Bassevi, Joseph, of Prague, 225,
226.
- Bayle, 290.
- Baynes, A., 289.
- Beaulieu, Leroy, 44.
- Beauvais, Vincent of, 162.
- Beazley, 197.
- Beck, J. J., 129.
- Beck, Karl, 304.
- Behain, Martin, 159.
- Behrends, Leffmann, 227.
- Beit, Alfred, 56.
- Belloc, Hilaire, 31.
- Below, 265.
- Benjamin of Tudela, 161, 197.
- Bentham, Jeremy, 303.
- Bentinck, Lord George, 311.
- Bergson, Henri, 46, 172, 179.
- Bernard, 167.
- Bernstein, E., 309.
- Bevis, Sir, of Hamton, romance
of, 182.
- Bickells, *Messe und Pascha*, 91.
- Bidpai, Fables of, 148, 154.
- Binney's sermons, 262.
- Bischoffheims, the, 242.
- Bismarck, Otto von, 27, 28, 30,
33, 36, 41, 306, 313.
- Black Death, 132, 134, 212, 216.
- Bleichroeders, the, 242.
- Bluntschli, 305.
- Boccaccio, 156.
- Bodin, Jean, 21, 141, 281, 285,
291, 318.
- Boehme, Jakob, 176.
- Boetius, 168.
- Bonacosa, a Jew of Padua, 154.
- Booth, A. J., 309.
- Börne, Ludwig, 31, 299, 300, 301,
302, 303.
- Bouquet, legal historian, 129.
- Bourgelot, 211.
- Bossuet, 270.
- Bourse, the, 221, 255.
- Bovobuch*, 182.
- Bracciolati, Poggio, 180.
- Brandes, G., 305.
- Brewer, 145.
- Brixia, Johannes de, 146.
- Brodskys, the, 242.
- Bromet, Herz, 294.
- Broughton, Hugh, 273.
- Browne, Sir Thomas, 276.
- Browning, Robert, 111.
- Bruno, Giordano, 177, 179, 180.
- Buddha, religion of, 80.
- Burekhardt, 49, 180.
- Burk, Edmund, 47.
- Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*,
181.
- Buxtorfs, the, Hebraists, 273.
- Byron, 178, 240.
- Cahorsins, the, 211, 212.
- Calo, Maestro; *see* Kalonymos ben
Kalonymos.
- Calvin, 278.
- Calvinism, 96.
- Calvinists, the, 270.
- Cantor, Georg, 149.
- Cardan, 176.
- Carlbach, J., 160.
- Carvajal, Ferdinand, 222.
- Cassel, Ernest, 56.
- Castro, Orobio de, 291.

INDEX

- Chamber's *Medieval Stage*, 64.
 Chamberlain, Houston Stewart, 31,
 41, 42, 45, 51, 57, 66, 77, 81,
 83, 84, 106, 111, 182, 183, 201,
 303.
 Charlemagne, 123.
 Charles of Anjou, 144, 154.
 Chesterton, Gilbert K., 40.
 Chrysostom, St. John, 102.
 Cicero, 180.
 Claflin, H. B., 266.
 Clement VI., Pope, 159.
 Cobb, S. H., 287.
 Cohn, E., 206.
 Coit, Stanton, 40.
 Colbert, 284, 288.
 Coleridge, 178.
 Coke's Report, 120.
 Columbus, Christopher, 151, 159,
 185, 219.
 Confucius, 99.
 Conybeare, F. C., 98.
 Cotton, John, 275.
 Coulanges, chauvinism of, 27.
 Council of Elvira, 118.
 Creighton, Bishop, 278.
 Crescas, Hasdai, 177.
 Cresqucs, Jaffuda, 160, 161.
 Crémieux, Adolphe, 304.
 Cromwell, 23, 223, 284, 288, 296,
 317.
 Cunningham, 254.
 Curtze, M., 160.
 D'Aguilar, Moses, 234, 235.
 Dahn, chauvinism of, 27.
 Dante, 175, 180, 212, 262.
 Darmesteter, James, 109.
 David, Felicien, 308.
 De Goeje, M. J., 194, 197.
 D'Eichthal, Gustave, 308.
 Delitzsch, Friedrich, 77.
 De Pass Brothers, ship-owners,
 243.
 Descartes, 177.
 Devic, 203.
 Diaconus, Paulus, 193.
 Dicey's law, 311.
 Diderot, 290, 302.
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 24, 305, 306,
 311.
 Diestel, 49.
 Dietz, A., 288.
 Dobschütz, E. von, 70, 71, 72, 276.
 Döllinger, 305.
 Douay Version, 70.
 Dozy, R., 203.
 Draper, historian of philosophy,
 183.
 Dreyfus, Captain Alfred, 32, 314.
 Drumont, E., 106, 107.
 Ebionites, the, 102.
 Ehrenberg, R., 220, 232, 238, 255.
 Eliot, George, 178.
 Ellis, Havelock, 52.
 Elvira, Council of, 118.
 Emanuel ben Jacob, 151.
 Emden, Jacob, 291.
 Emerson, R. W., 291.
 Enfantin, 308.
 Engelmann, 203.
 Ense, Varnhagen von, 300.
 Epstein, M., 247.
 Es-Saffah, Caliph, 147, 148.
 Evans, 277.
 Eybeschuetz, Jonathan, 291.
 Faradj, Moses, 153.
 Favaro, 151.
 Fekar, B., 206.
 Ferrer, St. Vincent, 218.
 Ferrer Riots, 219.
 Fichte, 178, 306.
 Field, Marshall, 266.
 Figgis, J. N., 67, 141, 281, 312.
 Firdausi, epic of, 80.
 Fludd, R., 176.
 Fouqué, 300.
 France, Marie de, fables of, 182.
 Frederick II., 145.
 Freudenthal, on Leipzig fairs, 231.
 Friedlaender, I., 194.

INDEX

- Friedlander-Fuld, 242.
 Friedlander, G., 99.
 Friedlanders, the, 251.
 Froude, 178.
 Fuggers, the, 220, 232, 254.
 Fuld, Jewish banker, 239.
 Funk, Catholic theologian, 207.

 Gaius, Institute of, 61.
 Galen, 143, 153.
 Gama, Vasco da, 159.
 Garrison, F. H., 158.
 Gehenna, notion of, 97.
 Geiger, L., 272.
 Gentz, Friedrich von, 300.
 Gerard of Cremona, 145, 150, 153, 168.
 Gershom, Rabbi, of Mayence, 134.
 Gersonides; *see* Levi ben Gerson.
 Ghinkhiz Khan, 197.
 Gideon, Sampson, 235.
 Giercke, legal historian, 126, 141, 321.
 Gladstone, W. E., 305.
 Glückel of Hameln, 62, 263.
 Gobineau, race-theory of, 45.
 Goethe, W., 178, 260, 300.
 Goldberg, Miss Adelaide, 188.
 Goldsmid; *see* Mocatta and Goldsmid.
 Goldsmid, Abraham, 238.
 Goltz, von der, 86.
 Gooch, 67.
 Gospel lectures, 118.
 Graetz, H., 294.
 Gregoire, Abbé, memoirs of, 23.
 Gregorian music, 64.
 Gregory, Pope, 200.
 Gregory of Tours, 200.
 Gresham, Sir Thomas, 228.
 Grimani, Cardinal, 152.
 Gross, Charles, 215.
 Grunwald, M., 234.
 Guggenheim, firm of, 244.
 Gundisalvi, Dominic, 164, 168.
 Guttmann, J., 165, 169, 174.

 Gutzkow, 300.
 Guyau, 109.

 Hadley, 159.
 Haeckel, 178.
 Haftarat, 118.
 Hakluyt, 203.
 Hamilton, Sir William, 272.
 Hammer, 197.
 Hanseatic League, 257.
 Harnack, Adolf, 49, 94, 96, 101.
 Harris, Rendell, 100.
 Hartmann, Moritz, 299, 303, 304.
 Harun, al-Raschid, 123.
 Hatch, E., 49, 93.
 Haynes, E. S. P., 278.
 Heffter, legal historian, 115.
 Hegel, 178, 305.
 Heine, Heinrich, 31, 46, 239, 295, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 308.
 Helmont, von, 176.
 Hep-hep riots, 24.
 Hermann, the German, 145.
 Herwegh, 303.
 Herz, Henriette, 300.
 Herzl, Theodor, 62.
 Higher Anti-Semitism; *see* Anti-Semitism.
 Hill, J. J., 266.
 Hillel, 99, 240.
 Hippocrates, 153.
 Hirsch, Baron M. de, 242.
 Hispalensis, Johannes, 152, 164, 168.
 Hoadley, 21.
 Hobbes, Thomas, 21, 177, 285.
 Hobson, J. A., 249.
 Hoffmann, M., 206, 210, 215, 263.
 Hof-Jude, the, 225, 226, 227, 232, 233, 237.
 Hollander, J. H., 109.
 Horace, 81.
 Hoschander, Jacob, 14.
 Hugo, Victor, 300.
 Humboldt, Wilhelm von, 300.

INDEX

- Ibn Adret, Responsa of, 135.
 Ibn Daud; *see* John of Seville.
 Ibn Daud, Abraham, 166.
 Ibn Ezra, Abraham, 144, 147, 152, 155.
 Ibn Fakih, 197.
 Ibn Gabirol, 164, 166, 169, 170, 185.
 Ibn Khordadbeh, 122, 138, 194, 198.
 Ibn Makir, Jacob, 146, 152, 159, 185.
 Ibn Sid, Isaac, 151.
 Ibn Tibbon, Moses, 164, 167.
 Ibn Tibbon family, 144.
 Ibn Usaibi'fa, 157.
 Ibn Wakkar, Joseph, 151.
 Ibn Ya'kub, Ibrahim, 197.
 Ibn Zaddik, Joseph, 166.
 Ibn Zuhr; *see* Avenzoar.
 Immanuel of Rome, 46.
 Innes, author of *State and Church*, 321.
 Innocent III., Pope, 17, 122.
 Isaac, a Jew, sent by Charlemagne, 123.
 Isaacs, Nathaniel, 243.
 Israeli, Isaac, of Toledo, 151, 158, 185, 203.
 Istakhri, 203.
 Jacob, a Jew, assists Paravitus, 146.
 Jacob Aronicus, alchemist, 162.
 Jacob, G., 197.
 Jacobs, J., 135, 148, 210.
 Jacob's Staff, 159, 161, 176, 185.
 Jacoby, Johann, 299, 303, 304.
 Jansenism, 96.
 Jastrow, Morris, 78, 79.
 Jellinek, Adolph, 304.
 Jenks, E., legal historian, 117, 124, 205.
 Jesus, 99, 100, 108.
 Joel, Rabbi, translator of Indian tales, 155.
 Joel, M., 165, 171.
 John of Capua, convert, 153, 154.
 John of Salisbury, 167, 188.
 John of Seville, a convert, 146, 148, 149, 184.
 Joselmann of Rosheim, 225.
 Joseph family, the, 243.
 Josephus, 12, 101, 191.
 Jourdain, 169.
 Judæa, Maria, 162.
 Judæus, Isaac, 153.
 Judah al-Harizi, 146, 164, 167.
 Judah ha-Levi, 144, 166, 183.
 Julian, emperor, 77.
 Julius of Salerno, 182.
 Juster, J., 191, 193.
 Justinian, Institutes of, 61.
 Justinian, Novella of, 200.
 Justinian, Corpus Juris of, 261.
 Juvenal, 13.
 Kabbalah, the, 175, 176, 177, 179, 185, 260, 272, 276.
 Kalam, the, 166.
 Kalonymos ben Kalonymos, 152, 157.
 Kant, Immanuel, 78, 177, 178.
 Karpinsky, L. C., 147.
 Kayserling, M., 152.
 Kedushah, 91.
 Key, Ellen, 301.
 Kikuchi, Baron Dairoku, 88.
 Kimhi, 273.
 King James' Version, 70.
 Kingdom of Heaven, 95, 99.
 Kuenen, A., 107.
 Kuhn, Loeb & Co., firm of, 242.
 Lagarde, Paul de, 94.
 Lammens, D., 203, 204.
 Lamprecht, historian, 210.
 Lasker, Eduard, 27, 28, 313.
 Lassalle, Ferdinand, 309, 313.

INDEX

- Lassen, 77.
 Lateran Council, 122.
 Latis, Bonet de, 160.
 La Vega, Joseph de, 229.
 Lazards, the, 239.
 Lecky, historian of philosophy, 49,
 183, 289.
 Leclerc, 157.
 Lehmann, Behrend, 227.
 Leibnitz, 177.
 Leon, Messer, 180.
 Leone Hebreo, Messer, 181; *see*
 also Abarbanel.
 Lesseps, Ferdinand de, 308.
 Lessing, author of *Nathan der*
 Weise, 23, 79, 178.
 Levi, Asser, 266.
 Levi ben Gerson, 159, 160, 161,
 176, 185.
 Levin, Rahel, 300, 301.
 Levita, Elijah, 272.
 Lévy, Louis-Germain, 174.
 Levy, S., 95.
 Lewisohn, firm of, 244.
 L'Hopital, Michel, 21, 281.
 Liebmman, Jost, 227.
 Lightfoot, English Hebraist, 273.
 Locke, John, 21, 275, 285, 286.
 Loeb, Isidore, 85, 157.
 Lombards, the, 211, 212, 216.
 Lopez, Aaron, 244.
 Lowell, James Russell, 57.
 Luard, editor of *Matt. Paris*, 211.
 Luca, John, 151.
 Lucretius, 81.
 Lully, Raymond, 175, 179, 181.
 Luther, Martin, 70, 135, 175, 176,
 273.
 Lyon, Abraham de, 244.
 Lyra, N. de, 273.
 Macaulay, Lord, 23.
 Macpherson, 252.
 Madox, legal historian, 126.
 Magellan, 159.
 Magnus, Albertus, 165, 170, 172,
 173, 181, 186.
 Maimonides, Moses, 46, 144, 153,
 158, 162, 164, 166, 167, 168,
 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177,
 179, 185, 186.
 Maitland, legal historian, 115, 116,
 126, 141, 321.
 Mamran, a legal document, 255.
 Manasseh ben Israel, 273, 288.
 Mannetti, Agnolo, 180.
 Mannetti, Giannozzo, 180.
 Manoello, friend of Dante, 180;
 see also Immanuel of Rome.
 Mantino, Jacob, 157, 184.
 Marcuses, the, 251.
 Markgraf, on Leipzig fairs, 231.
 Marks, Samuel, 243.
 Marranos, the, 213, 218, 219, 222,
 223, 228, 245, 257, 264, 284,
 291.
 Marryatt, Captain, 231.
 Marx, Karl, 45, 299, 309.
 Mashallah, Jewish Arabian astrol-
 oger, 162.
 Maurus of Salerno, 182.
 Maynus, Magister, 146.
 Mazzini, 74, 304.
 Mecia, 160.
 Medigo, Elia del, 157, 184.
 Medina, Sir Solomon, 225.
 Meisels, Moses, 226.
 Meissner, Alfred, 304.
 Melancthon, 176.
 Mendelssohn, Dorothea, 299, 300.
 Mendelssohn, Henriette, 299.
 Mendelssohn, Moses, 291, 299.
 Mendelssohns, the, 251.
 Merton, Walter de, 116.
 Messer, Leon, 180.
 Messiah, notion of, 92, 97.
 Metternich, Prince, 299.
 Michelet, chauvinism of, 27.
 Mill, J. S., 308.
 Mirabeau, 294.

INDEX

- Mirandola, Pico de la, 151, 157,
 175, 180.
 Moccata and Goldsmid, bullion
 brokers, 222.
 Model, Marx, 227.
 Moltke, 86.
 Mommsen, Th., 31.
 Mond, Ludwig, 56.
 Monds, the, 241.
 Montagu, firm of, 240, 243.
 Montaigne, Michel de, 21, 281,
 289, 290, 291, 318.
 Montanism, 102.
 Montefiore, Claude G., 97.
 Montefiore, Sir Moses, 238.
 Mordecai, Abraham, 266.
 More, Sir Thomas, 285.
 Morgan, E. D., 266.
 Morton, Levi, 266.
 Mosenthals, the, 243.
 Moses, the laws of, 66.
 Moses of Oxford, 116.
 Moses ben Maimon; *see* Maimon-
 ides.
 Moulton, R. G., 86.
 Muhammed, 64, 121.
 Müller, Max, 83.
 Munk, Salomon, 170.
 Murray, J. R., 155.
 Murray's *History of Chess*, 81.
 Mutawakkil, Emir, 17.

 Nantes, Edict of, 280, 288, 317.
 Napoleon, 22, 238, 251, 295, 296,
 297, 298, 312, 318.
 Napoleon, Sanhedrin of, 296.
 Nathan, Ernesto, 304.
 Nathan, Signora, 304.
 Neuman, A. A., 135.
 Newburg, Philip, 266.
 Nicæa, Council of, 102.
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 40, 85, 170.
 Nunes, Dr., 244.

 Occam, 188.
 Omar, Caliph, 17.
 Oppenheimer, Emanuel, 226.
 Oppenheimer, Joseph Süß, 227.
 Oppenheimer, Samuel, 226, 233,
 234, 235.
 Oppenheims, the, 225.
 Oppenheims, the, 239.
 Ordination, 94.
 Orr, J., 108.
 Ostwald, 178.

 Paine, Tom, 286.
 Paracelsus, 176.
 Paravitus, 146.
 Paris, Matt., 211.
 Parma, M., 308.
 Pascal's *Pensées*, 273.
 Paulus Diaconus, 193.
 Pedro III. of Aragon, 145, 151.
 Peirese, 151.
 Pelavius, 151.
 Penn, William, 287.
 Pereire, Isaac, 307.
 Pereire, Jacob, 307.
 Pereire, Jacob Rodrigues, 307.
 Pereires, the, 240, 242, 307.
 Pfefferkorn, a convert, 272.
 Philo, 101.
 Pigeonneau, 204.
 Pisa, Leonardo di, 149.
 Planis, John de, 146.
 Plato, 81.
 Plato of Tivoli, 146, 149.
 Poliakovs, the, 242.
 Pollock, Sir Frederick, 49, 115,
 116, 141, 278.
 Polo, Marco, 161.
 Pomponati, 180.
 Pomponazzi, 289.
 Pope, J. E., 245.
 Port-Royalists, the, 270.
 Powell, York, 210.
 Presbyterians, the, 270.
 Prescobaldi, the, 220.

INDEX

- Prothero's *The Psalms in History and Biography*, 91.
- Ptolemy, Almagest of, 150.
- Quintilian, 180.
- Rachfahl, F., 265.
- Radanites, the, 123, 138, 147, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 202, 203, 204.
- Raffalovitch, Madame, 301.
- Ralph of Bruges, 146.
- Rashi, 273.
- Rathenau, 242.
- Raymond, archbishop of Toledo, 144, 168.
- Reinach, T., 191, 206.
- Regiomontanus, 159, 181.
- Renan, Ernest, 13, 28, 41, 42, 74, 77, 102, 156, 157, 178, 184, 260, 309.
- Reuchlin, J., 175, 272, 276.
- Rhazes, Arabic writer on medicine, 153.
- Ricardo's iron law, 309.
- Ridgeway, 204.
- Ritter, historian of philosophy, 170, 197.
- Rivera, Jacob, 244.
- Robert of Anjou, 145, 152.
- Robert the Englishman, 160.
- Robinson, 108.
- Rockefeller, J. D., 266.
- Rodrigues, Eugene, 307.
- Rodrigues, Olinde, 307.
- Roger of Parma, 182.
- Roland, Madame, 299.
- Roland of Parma, 182.
- Romano, Giuda, 180.
- Roscher, legal historian, 215, 257.
- Rothschild, Baron James de, 241.
- Rothschild, Mayer, 226.
- Rothschild, Mayer Amschel, 237.
- Rothschild, Nathan, 237, 238, 250.
- Rothschild's, the, 32, 239, 240, 242, 301, 314.
- Rousseau, 21, 275, 295.
- Russell, B., 177.
- Saadya, 144, 166.
- Sacrobosco, 181.
- Sadi, mystic poet, 80.
- St. Bernard, 106, 128.
- St. Cyril, bishop, 16.
- St. Francis, 87.
- St. Simon, 307, 308, 309.
- St. Simonism, 308, 309.
- Saladin of Parma, 182.
- Sanhedrin of Napoleon, 296.
- Saphir, 209, 303.
- Saracens, the, 123, 143, 201, 204.
- Savasorda; *see* Abraham bar Hiyya.
- Sayce, A. H., 182.
- Scaliger, 151.
- Schechter, Frank I., 116.
- Schelling, 178, 300.
- Scherer, legal historian, 115, 215.
- Schiller-Szinessy, S. M., 304.
- Schlegel, Friedrich von, 300.
- Schleiden, 49.
- Schleiermacher, 178, 300.
- Schmoller, G., 229, 236, 237, 251.
- Schopenhauer, A., 170.
- Schubert, Benedict, 266.
- Schueck, A., 159.
- Schürer, E., 191.
- Scot, Michael, 145, 146, 150, 156, 181, 184.
- Scotus, Duns, 170, 181, 188.
- Scotus, John, 188.
- Selden, John, 273.
- Seligmans the, 239.
- Semikah, 94.
- Servetus, 179, 288.
- Shakespeare, William, 270.
- Shaler, Prof., author of *The Neighbor*.
- Shammai, 240.

INDEX

- Shelley, 178.
 Simon ben Shetah, 93.
 Singer, Paul, 309.
 Skeat, 203.
 Skinner, J., 108.
 Smith, D. E., 147.
 Smith, A. L., 135.
 Socinianism, 283.
 Sombart, Werner, 48, 215, 228, 229, 247-267.
 Sozzini, Fausto, 283.
 Sozzini, Lelio, 283.
 Spencer, Herbert, 178.
 Speyer, Edgar, 56.
 Speyers, the, 239.
 Spinoza, Baruch, 21, 46, 49, 170, 177, 178, 179, 185, 260, 284, 285, 288, 318.
 Staël, Madame de, 299.
 Stahl, Friedrich Julius, 24, 305, 306, 313.
 Steckelmacher, M., 255, 263.
 Stein, L., 177.
 Steinschneider, Moritz, 140, 142, 148, 149, 151, 157, 158, 162, 181, 188.
 Steintal, 78, 80.
 Stephen, Leslie, 289, 308.
 Sterns, the, 239, 240.
 Stevenson, Robert Louis, 86.
 Stoecker, Adolf, 28.
 Stoeckl, A., 28, 175, 186.
 Straus, Oscar S., 68, 287.
 Strozzi, the, 220, 232.
 Stuyvesant, Peter, 287.
 Sufism, 175.
 Surenhus, Dutch Hebraist, 273.
 Süßkind von Trimberg, Jewish Minnesinger, 182.
 Swift, J., 290.
 Tacitus, 13.
 Taraseon, Bonfils de; *see* Emanuel ben Jacob.
 Taylor, C., 100.
 Taylor, H. O., 168.
 Tennant, 95.
 Thackeray, W. M., 263.
 Theodosian code, 118.
 Treitschke, Heinrich von, 30, 31, 41, 302.
 Trisagion, 91.
 Tugendbund, the, 300.
 Ulfilas, translator of the Gospels, 70.
 Ultramontanes, the, 321.
 Vasco da Gama, 159.
 Vechino, Joseph, 151.
 Veit, Moritz, 308.
 Veits, the, 251.
 Villanova, Arnold de, 182.
 Vinci, Leonardo da, 160.
 Virchow, 31.
 Visigoth kings, 121.
 Vogel, Sir Julius, 243.
 Voltaire, 21, 290, 302.
 Waetjen, H., 253.
 Wagner, Richard, 182.
 Waitz, chauvinism of, 27.
 Waldegrave, Countess, 301.
 Warburgs, the, 239.
 Ward, Sir A. W., 305.
 Weber, Max, 258.
 Weigel, German mystic, 176.
 Weill, Georges, 309.
 Wellesley, Lord, 238.
 Wernber, Beit & Co., 243.
 Wertheimer, Samson, 226.
 Wertheimer, Samuel, 226.
 Wertheimer, Wolf, 226.
 Wertheimers, the, 225, 234.
 William of Auvergne, 164, 169.
 William the Conqueror, 124.
 William the Fleming, 145.
 Williams, Roger, 244, 287.
 Wilson, Woodrow, 65.

INDEX

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Wiseman, Cardinal, 70. | Yezdegird II., persecution of, 15. |
| Wittmann, historian of philosophy,
171. | <i>Yezzer ha-Ra'</i> , 100. |
| Wolf, G., 226. | Young, Arthur, 252. |
| Wolf, L., 224. | Yule's Glossary, 203, 204. |
| Wocher, the, Jewish itinerant | Zwinglians, the, 270. |
| agents, 231. | Zacuto, Abraham, 151, 160. |
| Worms, Jacob, 225. | Zola, É., 240. |
| | Zunz, Leopold, 161, 304. |

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388

Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

JAN 10 2008

OCT 06 2008

University of California, Los Angeles



L 007 087 762 6

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 001 040 271 7

